Canadian
Pamphlets

3372

Norris, William
The Canadian question. Montreal, 18

Cop. 1

Pamph
Canada
Hist.
N.

THE CANADIAN QUESTION,

BY

WILLIAM NORRIS,

LATE CAPTAIN CANADIAN VOLUNTEERS.

Montreal:

PRINTED BY THE LOVELL PRINTING AND PUBLISHING COMPANY.

1875.

THE

CANADIAN QUESTION

BY

WILLIAM NORRIS,

Late Captain Canadian Volunteers.

Montreal:

Printed by the Lovell Printing and Publishing Company.
1875.

THE CANADIAN QUESTION.

CHAPTER I.

The Leading Principle of Modern Government.

In the Science of Government, as well as in all other sciences, we find mankind continually at a loss to reconcile the different theories with the actual experience of the race. To do this many shifts have been resorted to, and the first great fiction, which we find underlying all others, is what is called the original compact. This is a supposed agreement said to have been made by the people and their first ruler, by which the people gave up certain rights which they possessed by nature, in consideration of being protected in those which they retained; and in order to enable the ruler to protect these retained rights he was invested with certain power —the power and force of the whole community. This agreement supposes a time anterior to the period of history, a place not known or heard of, and a degree of knowledge incompatible with the position of the parties to it. To answer its purpose as the foundation of all government the parties must have known the benefits derivable from that institution, and, if so, this knowledge must have been derived from experience. If they had not this knowledge, then the people received no consideration for the rights they gave up; for, if the original compact was the foundation of government, they had no means of compelling protection, nor no reason to assume benefit from that protection if they had. Then if they knew that that protection was to be relied on, and that benefit was to be the result of it, evidently that knowledge must have been obtained by

experience, and hence we have government before the original compact. Not to speak of this intrinsic objection there are others more forcible. The annals of the human race give no sign whatever that any thing of the kind ever happened. The plain where the immense crowd is said to have collected and elected the first ruler exists only in the imagination of the first logician who found it necessary in order to give symmetry to his theory. If history is to be consulted, it will be found not only is there no trace of an original compact, but every thing directly the contrary, and for the elucidation of a positive science we must be content with what is known. Indeed the original compact in the Science of Government may be aptly likened to the primary rocks in that of Geology. There may be both a compact and a primary rock, but we know about as much of the one as the other, and we are indebted for both to those men who think that it is necessary in every thing to have a starting point, and, if they cannot find one, manufacture it.

History furnishes, no doubt, many instances where this fiction has been used by men belonging to all parties. It has been, in all ages, the fruitful theme of innovators and radicals, and has furnished an excuse for thousands of ambitious men, but there is no trace whatsoever of the thing itself. Mankind has never been found ungoverned, there is seemingly no existence for humanity without government. From the Digger Indian to the Patrician Roman, government seems a necessity. As there are no means, therefore, of ascertaining the state of man without government, and as we always find him within its influence, we are bound to consider it from the positive materials at our command, and to eschew those theoretical surmises which, however necessary to the airy castles which we build up in our imaginations, have no place in the solid realities of life.

The history of mankind is a record of its actions, and from the review and contemplation of these actions, it is said, we derive benefit. This depends a good deal upon

something else. If man is continually progressive, then history is of little use, as the actions of an ignorant age can be no guide for an enlightened one; if, however, history repeats itself, nothing can be more valuable. Experience goes to prove that man is not continually progressive, but that periodically he traverses, between the extremes of ignorance and intelligence, an immense area. The same causes which affect the individual man affect also communities. The characteristics of the individual are the characteristics of the nation. Men by thousands are born, arrive at maturity and become extinct in a period. Perchance some individual trait keeps some alive in the memory of survivors, or a tomb tells to the stranger, for a little time, that such an one existed, but the common lot is oblivion and extinction. The same may be said of nations: they come into being, arrive at maturity, and become extinct in a period, the only difference is the duration of the period. The greatest imaginable stretch of time and the shortest are in comparison with eternity equal, hence there is not much difference. Some peculiar national characteristic, or a material memento, may for a time preserve their memory, but obeying every thing human they become extinct, and new national life springs from their remains. No one believes that the physical power of the Roman, or the intellectual superiority of the Greek, will keep them alive for ever, any more than that the Pyramids of Egypt, those monuments of dead and extinct communities, can endure.

The same causes operate upon the lives of nations as upon those of individuals. Some die of disease, others of old age. Individual man by excess engenders corruption, and corruption death. Nations, or man in the aggregate, go through the same course. Want begets industry; industry, wealth; wealth, luxury; luxury, corruption, and the latter extinction; but out of extinction generally commences a new life. The whole object of nature seems to be reproduction, not only in regard to individuals, but to nations.

The same may be said of intelligence. Human knowledge

seems to be subject to the same fluctuations as every thing else belonging to man, and may be divided into epochs Epochs of intelligence seem to add little to the sum of their successors. Our epoch has derived little from that, the last glimmering of which shone so brilliantly on Egypt. We cannot conclude that that intelligence was confined to Egypt alone, but probably it died out earlier in other countries.

Since then nothing seems fixed, but everything in motion; since man seems doomed, like Sisypus, to roll his stone to the top of the mountain only to find that he has to commence at the bottom again, and since, above all, human nature is the same now as it ever was, still governed by the same passions and influenced by the same fears, history must in all cases be beneficial, not as furnishing particular facts, for as such it is useless, but as presenting those things which accelerated national greatness, and delayed national extinction, and elevated or degraded the race as a whole.

Now, looking at the Science of Government through history in this light, what seems to be the governing influence? The opinions of historians seem unreliable. This one will say truth and justice, the other corruption. The most impartial are biased, and given to hero worship. This one worships force, that one tact, the other magnificence. Each one forms an idea or a theory, and facts are warped to suit that idea or theory. Historians claim to be indifferent, but ideas and theories in civilized communities grow with the growth of men, and unconsciously affect their judgment. Impartial history is an impossibility, so long as religious belief is in its present position. History at present is but the abuse of the rival sects. As sectarianism is at the present time prevented from doing any thing worse than railing by public opinion, it seeks to perpetuate itself by mutual abuse and rancor. Facts are right and wrong, constitutional and unconstitutional, as they support or defeat certain principles. The massacre of St. Bartholomew is the disgrace or the glory of France, as if it were possible to form two opinions

on such a fact. In the history of England more especially is this ineradicable prejudice to be found, more, possibly, than in that of any other country. Men of the greatest learning and genius, who have written what they are pleased to call its history, cannot prevent themselves from showing their bias, and coloring all their statements. Mr. Macaulay writes an imaginative account of the Whig party and an eulogium of its great idol William III, and calls it a history of England. Dr. Lingard writes a justification of the Roman Church in England, and calls it the history of England, and lawyers such as Blackstone and Hallam, men from whom impartiality ought to be had, give us their accounts of the constitution from their respective political standpoints. According to the one there has been no interruption in the legitimate line of sovereigns, while Hallam has not a word to say derogatory to the conduct of Henry VIII in regard to the church property, or his usurping the powers of the House of Commons, while the declaration of indulgence of James II to Roman Catholics and Dissenters respecting penal laws, which would be a disgrace to the Sandwich Islands, is deemed an act so unconstitutional as not to be atoned for but by the loss of his throne.

The governing principle in England in all ages seems to have been expediency. To all those who believe that government is founded upon those great principles, right and justice, which are popularly supposed to be absolute, this statement will appear surprising; but to those who know that these are relative terms so far as governments consider them, it will appear nothing but a truism. If the leading facts of English history be examined, even in the most cursory manner, its truth will be readily discovered. Judging by what is called strict right, half the sovereigns of England were usurpers, and the allegiance of the people was transferred voluntarily, or forcibly secured without the least scruple, or as expediency required. To prove this, it is not necessary to go back further than the reign of Henry VIII. There is not much English history

before this reign. The conflicting interests of families and faction, may, according to some, constitute materials for history, but the action of the people must, in all cases, be its chief ingredient. Besides there was no constitutionalism before this reign—or rather the constitution grew out of the excesses of this king and his children. It is impossible to suppose a constitution and feudalism existing at the same time in the same country, the one is the opposite of the other, and it is undeniable that it was on feudal principles the wars of the Edwards were carried on, and also the civil wars between York and Lancaster. Parliaments, no doubt, were summoned by those princes, but it was only for the purpose of giving color to their usurpations and acting as the willing instruments of their tyranny. The period before Henry VIII, however, presents more examples of what is contended for than the time since this reign; but as it may be justly said that it belonged to or closely verged on what are called the dark ages, it would not be so forcible to adduce arguments from this time, as from those times that are esteemed by all more enlightened.

The Reformation was a matter of expediency; judging it by the rules of justice, it was unjustifiable. For centuries the Roman Church had occupied the first place in the estimation of the people, and in the councils of the sovereign. A large part of the landed property of the kingdom had been in its possession, acquired by means then held more sacred than the acquisition by purchase. Thirty-three mitered Abbots and Bishops sat in the House of Lords, and had sat there beyond legal memory. All the essentials of the right by prescription belonged to the Roman Church, and this kind of title was the one that then obtained most respect. Indeed there is no instance, since the Reformation, of this kind of right being so well fortified in the possessors as it was in that Church. Besides owning the great part of the land, the tenets and principles of the Roman faith were engrafted in the manners, customs and minds of the King and his people. No sovereign was so much against the new religion as

Henry, and the title of Defender of the Faith, still retained by his successors, proves that if he did not write the defense attributed to him, it was under his auspices it was published. If right and justice ever combined to secure a system, surely the Roman system in England was founded on them; but right and justice were powerless against expediency. It became expedient that England should become independent, hence the Reformation in defiance of all so-called right. Religion had little to do in the inauguration of this great revolution, and from that time this great element of civilization became subservient to that other great idea, nationality.

In the subsequent reigns of Edward, Mary and Elizabeth, the people were dragooned from one religion to the other, as the expediencies of the sovereigns and the safety of the nation required. In Mary's reign, in order to satisfy the half-quenched prejudices of the people, and the bigotry of herself and her husband, certain men were executed, partly for treason but more from religious motives, while during the reign of Elizabeth, the whole people, manifestly against right and justice, were forcibly compelled to receive the reformed religion. But although this course of treatment was unjust, it was expedient. English independence was in jeopardy, and the fluctuating notions of the masses, at that time in religion, were not allowed to effect the safety of the State. There can be no doubt that mankind is indebted for the blessings flowing from the Reformation to the idea of complete nationality which first began to spread in the fifteenth century, and which seems to have spread and to have had as much effect on the Continent of Europe as it had in England. No nationality can be complete, so long as a large portion of its inhabitants look to a foreign temporal prince in such an important element as religion, as the supreme head—a ruler who taught them to believe that the State derived its powers from him. It was highly desirable and expedient for national safety and honor that this foreign power in England should be abolished, and hence the Reformation, not because it was right and just.

On the death of Elizabeth another innovation took place on the ground of expediency. In the reign of Henry VIII, that monarch was empowered by Act of Parliament to devise the crown by will, and acting on the power, he bequeathed it to the line of his younger sister, ignoring that of the elder, the Queen of Scotland. One would suppose that right and justice would have enforced this will in favor of the devisees; but expediency again was the most powerful, and James of Scotland was made King of England. According to this king, owing, as he said, to his combining in his own person the rights of every possible claimant that ever wore the crown, he obtained it by the special interposition of Providence; but even this supreme right was of no avail, as his son was dethroned and beheaded in the next reign. Again, during the reign of Charles II, we find expediency attempting to set aside right in the Exclusion Bill, and although it then failed when that expediency became more manifest in the next reign it was completely successful. Historians, as a general thing, attempt to reconcile the most of the changes of government in England, with the exception of the Commonwealth, previous to the revolution of 1688, to their notions of right as held by their respective parties or religions, but nearly all agree in ascribing this latter great event purely to expediency. In this instance we see not only a king but his whole family set aside, contrary to the plainest rules of right and justice, to answer the purpose of expediency in government. Again, by the Act of Settlement, expediency took the place of right, and, indeed, it would be difficult to determine what great act of the English people has not been inspired by this great principle. Nothing seems to have been effective in lessening its influence. The revolution of 1688 was only successful in one of its objects, the preservation of the Protestant religion. The arbitrary acts of William were equal, if not greater, than those of James, while he trebled the expenses of the government; but, notwithstanding this, in view of the domineering influence of Louis IV, it was expedient to keep him upon the Throne.

Money or arbitrary power had little weight with the English people against what they thought expedient. Neither had magnificence, glory, or the other passions which animate and sway a high-spirited people. The sordid ignorant meanness of the first princes of the House of Brunswick, and the unheard-of corruption of Walpole, had no influence against that expediency which required the Throne to be occupied by any one but the Pretender. These inglorious boors presented a great contrast to their predecessors William and Anne, but they were borne, and the beneficial results of all those sacrifices are now being enjoyed.

In reviewing these circumstances it is obvious that there are two births in the lives of nations, as well as in those of individuals. The individual is born of the flesh and of the spirit, and although the birth of body is important, unless the mind is awakened also, the man is nothing. Millions of men go through the world without this awakening, and with nothing but a knowledge just above animal instinct to guide them. In these the birth of mind has not taken place at all ; in others it only takes place in a late period in life, and the usefulness of the man has been nearly entirely lost. The same thing may be said of nations ; they are all born again. It is a crowning glory for the English people that their nation was the first in the present cycle of civilization to experience the new birth. The spirit of the Anglo-Saxon can be best judged by this. He did in the year 1642 what the Gaul did not do till 1793, what the Germans only attempted in 1847, and what the Spaniards did only so late as 1868.

Is it then any wonder, when we see this advancement of mind in the Englishman, that the same feeling should not be manifested by his descendants everywhere? Changes so fundamental in the Government of England, and the transfers of the loyalty of the people necessitated by such changes, must of necessity have been observed by others. No matter what politicians may have written or divines have taught about divine right, or even the uninterrupted

descent of the crown, or the inviolability of the king's person, the most obtuse could not fail to see that it was the principle of expediency that always succeeded. Hence when it became expedient, the Americans threw off the connection with England; this was contrary to what the Englishmen thought right and just; but it was quite agreeable to what the Americans thought constituted those principles. The true solution will be found in the fact that American independence was expedient; and on this ground that independence was acknowledged by England.

It has thus been found that the modern principle of Government in England, which country is Canada's best example, is expediency; and that the only judges of that expediency are the people immediately interested. The advocates of unconditional loyalty or allegiance under all circumstances are at the present time scarce. The freedom which has resulted to the English people, and the political happiness which they enjoy, are the best proof that good has resulted; and the greatness to which England has arisen is the best proof that government by expediency is right. None other can ever be adapted to the Anglo-Saxon race, as government must adapt itself to the growth of a people, and to the circumstances in which they are placed. This can be seen to advantage in the growth of the American nation, and the modifications which their constitution have undergone. Among that people we see the seed planted and gradually growing to maturity under our eyes. No man who saw the departure of the few colonists two hundred and fifty years ago could predict the mighty nation they have since become. The lessons of history were not lost upon them, and, through following these lessons faithfully, have they arrived at their present position. These lessons were embodied at the outset in their constitution. That constitution was as clothing made of man's size for an infant. The expansion which its sagacious founders foresaw was allowed for, and though in latter days the garment has undergone enlargement and renovation, still there is every reason to believe that under

its folds the United States may grow to that full maturity to which they are approaching. In Canada, also, though to a much less extent, the same principles of expediency have been recognized. The Governor and his Council was an institution once in our land, and according to some of our best men, Sir John Beverly Robinson for instance, it was the acme of everything great and good. Long arguments have been put forward that it was the only kind of government possible for colonies ; but the man who advocated such a government for Canada now would be deemed absurd. It yielded like all to the potent influence of expediency. Men were found in our country, as well as in all others, who stigmatised the change required in our government by the natural growth of our people in number, wealth and intelligence as radicalism and treason ; but this must be expected. Light falls first upon the highest hills ; the hillocks and the earth receive it later. There were men in the country who objected to confederation. This is another great measure for which we are indebted to the great principles of which we have been speaking. As isolated provinces England surely foresaw that we would fall a prey to the rapacity and cupidity of the Americans, but, as a firmly-united confederacy, such an event was almost impossible. Hence the expediency of confederation.

As it is then a fact recognized by all judges who have given this subject any attention that mankind is continually traversing a great area, which is bounded by the extremes of ignorance and intelligence, absolute schemes of government must be impossible, and unconditional allegiance a myth. Absolute schemes may be attempted ; but their fruitlessness will be experienced much more forcibly in the future than in the past. Progress gives an impetus to the motion of communities, and any system that would attempt to arrest that onward motion must be vain and foolish, and surely destined to perish.

CHAPTER II.

The People of Canada.

All sudden changes of government, for which the people are not prepared, are to be avoided. A people must be educated to see the benefit arising from any great change before it should be attempted, otherwise it is more likely to turn out disastrous than beneficial. Ready-made laws and systems of government are never successful. All laws and systems of government originate and are matured through successive generations. This is especially the case in regard to English institutions. All English common law is custom, and all Statute law is condensed public opinion. The same may be said of Canada; the task of the legislator is made light, he has only to embody in his statute the public opinion, which has grown ripe for such condensation; and the best legislator is he who knows when that time has arrived. Indeed this is the only safe law-making process in any part of the world, and constitutions are only a superior class of laws. When this process has materially been departed from we see nothing but bloodshed and ruin. The commonwealth of England was manufactured for the time, but it did not last long. The French revolution of 1793 is the next attempt at a great sudden change, but the excess of that terrible period proves beyond a doubt, that a change from a feudal monarchy to the license of a republic in a few years is not to be had easily. The present Spanish Republic is very likely to turn out as much of a failure. The people, accustomed for centuries to rely on their priests and nobles, are incapable of bearing the burden of liberty; and the result can be easily foreseen—some strong man will seize on the government, and in the interests of law and order, and to avoid anarchy, he will be supported.

It may be said that the American revolution is an exception to the principle mentioned, but it is only an apparent one. The American people, before the revolution, through their municipal systems, were educated in all the phases of self-government. The different colonies were self-sustaining; and the mere change from the nominal subjection of England to independence was not much of a strain on the self-reliant character built up by a new country, common schools, and local self-government.

It then follows that to make any change in government of a fundamental nature, the people must be prepared to receive such change, and capable of sustaining it, after it is made. The nature, peculiarities, and character of the people of this country, then, would have to be taken into consideration, in view of any change in their present position.

One of the most natural elements of the greatness of a country is the quality of the race of people that inhabit it; its progress and well-being depend upon their character. That character, when the people are native born, is formed by the institutions, the soil, and the climate. Strangers are not so much affected by these causes, inasmuch as their character was formed before coming to the place of their residence. Institutions of a civil kind, however, affect the foreigner and the native alike; but the latter much more than the former; but religious institutions taking hold of man so soon as reason commences, and at that time creating impressions which never can be totally effaced, affect all men, no matter where they may reside, or in whatever circumstances they may be placed. These institutions, then, affect the people of Canada; and, as the different sects in the country are numerous and various, a short attempt to describe the character formed by the most prominent becomes necessary, and in this attempt the temporal effects only of the teaching of the different denominations will be spoken of. As to the truth or falsity of such teaching a secular writer has nothing to do, as that part exclusively belongs to the province of the ecclesiastic.

There are, in Canada, four prominent denominations of Christians—the Roman Catholic, the Presbyterian, the Protestant Episcopal, and the Methodist. The character formed by Roman Catholic teaching is difficult to describe minutely, but the main traits will be sufficient. The great fault seems to be the absence of self-reliance. It cultivates the heart at the expense of the brain, and brings out more feeling than thought. The people, taught to rely on the Church for all religious instruction, come at last to consult it on their secular affairs, and hence they lack that spirit of enterprise which is the product of personal independence. This Church forms amiable characteristics, but few forcible traits. Among its members are to be found, however, men of power and force, but such are not strict communicants. The tenets of the Church, at least those which are taught to the laity, are much more adapted to form female character in perfection than strong men. It educates the senses by its majestic music, its gorgeous ceremonies, and its mysterious rites; and it aims at subduing men through every avenue save the reason. The true votaries of this Church are apt to be soft, amiable, good and contemplative. It is not, consequently, surprising, that so many of its members should prefer total solitude, as many did in the earlier ages. It is not a system that makes temporal heroes: if ever one of that faith appears, it is more than likely that he is animated by fanaticism. Indeed it has never formed any great governing states. It may be said that France, under the first Empire, was Catholic, but it was only in name. A century of philosophy, and the first revolution, had left little Catholicism in the French armies that conquered Europe. Spain, also, at one time, may seem an objection; but the conquests of that power were chiefly over nations of the same faith, or the half-civilized people of America. The Catholic, then, is amiable, good, ordinarily active and truthful. These qualities are predicated of the general educated laity only. As to the priests, and those strong exceptional characters which no system can keep down, they may be included among this

people; but, through force of character and position, they stand apart. The general body of the people may, and to a certain extent are, influenced by the latter class; but the infusions from which the Catholic laity derive the most benefit are received from the surrounding Protestants. Their push, force and assiduity tell, and make the Catholic of the Province of Ontario quite a different man from his co-religionist of Quebec. If, however, the possession of the moral virtues be any set-off to the lack of those temporal qualities which secure opulence and power in this world, the Catholic, indeed, has the advantage. There are in the Dominion, 1,492,029 persons who belong to this denomination.

The effects of Presbyterianism are exactly the reverse of Catholicism. The teaching of this system seems to bring out the reasoning powers at the expense of all feeling, but these reasoning powers are confined to secular subjects in other countries. In Canada the keen penetrating intellect of the Presbyterian examines religious matters with the same exactitude as secular affairs. The system as practiced in this country makes strong, rugged, resolute, independent men, fit to do battle with and conquer all obstacles in their way to wealth and power. It is difficult to find any refinement of feeling as the result of it, simply because the senses are entirely ignored as a means of obtaining religious impressions. The comfort and prosperity, however, which are the usual attendants of Presbyterianism, make up to its members for the loss of those pleasures derivable from cultivated feelings, which, never having been known, are not missed. The ruling traits seemed to be developed by this system of teaching are practicability, and worldly-mindedness. Protestantism of all kinds gives this advantage over Catholicism. The great doctrine, that faith alone is sufficient for salvation, relieves the Protestant from those expiatory works which are incumbent upon Catholics; and leaves his hands and his mind at liberty to secure those worldly advantages which are to be obtained by men who bend all their energies to the

task. The Presbyterian character is no doubt the best for new countries. The resolute courage and determination which invariably accompany it, soon change forests into cultivated fields. Some of the greatest characters of modern times have been the direct fruits of its teachings. Above all, it furnishes man with those qualities which give him command of his fellows, and secure his own worldly prosperity, and in a strictly temporal view, seems best adapted to raise the lower classes to comfort by the inculcation of industry, frugality and piety. The number of persons belonging to this denomination in the Dominion is about 543,659.

The Protestant Episcopal Church fills a medium place between those extremes. The character formed by its teaching is more equable and refined than that of the Presbyterian, and more resolute than the Catholic. The church in general is the asylum for the indifferent. All those who aspire to social position, commence their progress by joining it and forming their manners after the model of its members. It makes a good class of citizens of native Canadians, although the same cannot be said of its effects upon its foreign members. Its great lack is vitality. It partakes too much of the inertness which distinguishes its great prototype, the Roman Catholic Church, and it never can be the Church of Canada owing to this defect. On the whole it creates a character stable and respectable. It has 494,049 members in the Dominion.

The future Church of Canada, from all appearances, is the Methodist. Continually aggressive, it seizes on all kinds of material, and, by force of its discipline, forms a character more uniform and steady than all other denominations. No such extremes are to be found within its ranks, as those which the Roman Church presents in the educated French and the uneducated native, or which the Protestant Episcopal presents in the English gentleman and the Irish Protestant. There may not be any great amount of mental activity among its members; but the Church is continually adapting

itself to the growing intellectual wants of the people, and its marked success may be seen in the fact that the Episcopal Church is adopting its rules and proselytising discipline. The emotional temperament may be in the ascendant, but it is never allowed to run into fanaticism. The intellectual power might be cultivated more, and the literal meaning of the Scriptures followed less, but, notwithstanding these defects, the Methodist character, by its uniformity and respectability, its enterprise without recklessness, its piety without fanaticism, its weight without obstinacy, and its decent hilarity without descending to vulgar debauchery and levity, on the one hand, or puritanic asceticism on the other, is most likely to be the national one in Canada; and to eventually become in this country, what it is in the United States, the governing element of the nation. The efforts of this Church lately, to inculcate a national sentiment and to cultivate a spirit of independence, are turning large numbers towards it. It has already given promise of its future career in Canada by severing all connection with the English Conference, and endeavouring to unite its scattered branches. It had in 1871, when the census was taken, 367,091 members. The increase in the members of this Church during the last ten years is greater than that of any other. During that time they increased 27 per cent., while the Presbyterians increased 19 per cent, the Roman Catholics 8.7, and the Church of England only 6.2.

In this short attempt to show the kind of character arising from the teachings of the most prominent denominations, no consideration has been given to the effect which the municipal institutions of the country, and the government, have on character; nor the material modifications which take place by association and political combinations. One thing is certain, that every year the animosity which formerly existed among those sects is growing less. Tolerance of each other's opinions and doctrines is observed, more probably arising from the Common School System of the country, which educates all sects alike, with the exception

of the Catholics. Indeed, all the harsher features described in these sketches of character, as belonging to the different sects, are smoothed and rounded off by the beneficent effects of Common School education. This School System is so perfect in Canada that no fear can be felt for the capability of the present generation of Canadians to sustain any change which circumstances may force upon them.

As a further means of judging of the character of the people of the Dominion, a short statement of the different nationalities or races which make up its population may be of use. 1082,948 of the people are of French origin, and of the different races which inhabit the country they are the least fitted for self-government. The contentment which desires no change is theirs. They are entirely different from the present race of French in France. They never derived any benefit from the numerous revolutions which have created the political activity of France; and are a century behind their countrymen in the Old World. Secure in the silence and tranquility of their summer woods, and winter snows, they scarcely heard the thunder of the mighty conflicts, physical and mental, which convulsed Europe during the latter end of the eighteenth century; and it is astonishing to learn that it is only a few years ago that feudal tenure of land was abolished among them. Although, however, the rural French Canadian is backward, the French inhabitants of the cities are further advanced in politics and general intelligence than the English-speaking people of the other Provinces. They have no old country to claim a divided allegiance, and, as a consequence, everything is due to Canada. The rural population also every year is advancing steadily in political knowledge. Large numbers of these go to the United States every summer, bringing back and imparting to those who remain, American ideas.

706,369 are of English origin, and form a valuable part of the population. The national characteristics of the Englishman are too well known to require any description. 846,414 are of Irish origin, 549,946 of Scotch origin, and 232,613 of German

and Dutch origin. The most encouraging fact brought out by the last Census is that 83 in every 100 of the population are native-born Canadians, and probably ten more in every 100 were brought to Canada so young as to regard it as their native land.

The political institutions of every country, follow to a certain extent the prevailing religion. In this way, and in no other, can it be said that the State derives any power from the church. If the Church and State are, united, politics and religion are more akin. These were separated, however, in Upper Canada at an early day, and the political institutions of Ontario are, in consequence, more liberal and approximate, more to those of the United States than those of any other part of the country. The effect of those institutions is evidenced every day in the case of the immigrants who come to our shores. They come to us from the monarchical countries of Europe ignorant, rude, and unmannerly, depending on their priests and ministers for religious instruction, and on their landlords and the manufacturers for the means of a precarious livelihood, they are servile, dependent, weak and irresolute. A few years use to the strengthening influence of our institutions, and they become completely changed. On their first arrival, with hat in hand, and stammering speech, they ask for leave to toil as was their wont; but having learned what it is to own a farm of their own, subject to the will and caprice of no one, having learned their importance as members of a free community, they hold a high head, and call no man master. Where there was nothing but humility and servility, we find a legitimate pride, and a simple, manly independence. Where there was almost childish helplessness we find a vigorous self-reliant spirit, and the mind that formerly bent the knee to the meretricious advantages of rank sees nothing worthy of its respect but the majesty of law and the nobility of liberty and freedom. Owing to this effect of our institutions, there are very few of the peasant class to be found in Canada. Some of the inhabitants may be poor, but this circum-

stance has little influence on their independence. A fearless enunciation of opinion, and a dread, in many instances a contempt, for the influence of wealth, are the common characteristics, even of the poorest. The sense of the value of integrity, knowledge, honesty, and all those other attributes which ennoble man, no matter in what condition of life he may be, tend to sustain the Canadian in his personal respect, no matter what privations he may be called upon to endure.

The character of the surface of the country also, no doubt, has an elevating influence on the people. There is an education in broad rivers, boundless prairies, high mountains, and pathless woods, unknown to the dwellers in towns and cities. The mind that revels in the wilds of nature can never be actuated by the meannesses of civilization, be it never so illiterate. There is an expanding influence in great things that cannot long be withstood. Little minds cannot exist in vastness; they must either increase or become imbecile, terrified by the weight of their sensations. Solitude also begets gravity and thought—thought forcing examination of surroundings, whether of earth, air or water. Hence the instinctive sagacity of the backwoodsman. He may never have seen a letter or a compass; he may never have seen the inside of a school house, but the accuracy of his senses is wonderful, and his mental deductions from sensations no less so.

The climate of a country, no less than its soil and the configuration of its surface, also affect strongly the character of its inhabitants. In tropical countries, where the bounties of nature are so plentiful, no exertion to support life is necessary—or rather the slightest exertion obtains all the necessaries. The intense heat of the sun also debilitates the human frame, and renders man prone to inaction; while nature, as if to provide for its own defects, scatters in wild profusion food which supports life without the effort of cultivation or thought. The prevailing characteristics of the inhabitants of tropical climates are indolence and in

action, and an imbecility of mind and body, as compared with the natives of northern countries. The non-enterprising spirit of the Southern States has been ascribed to the institution of slavery; but it could with more justice be ascribed to the climate. For a time the infusion of new blood from the North may revolutionize the South, but it cannot retain its vitality long. The enervating influence of the climate must in the end be felt; and, when that time comes, the absence of slavery or of some coercive system of labor must leave the South in a worse condition than it is now. Voluntary labor will not do, as its inducements are not sufficient to overcome the temptations to enjoy the luxuries which nature voluntarily dispenses. Such being the case, we can only look for weakness from a tropical country, while we have the opposite reasons to expect courage, strength and energy from the north. In a country where nature unaided gives nothing, exertion of mind and body is one of the conditions of existence. The mind harassed by the wants of the body is kept in a continual state of activity, and even after these wants are fully provided for, the constant habit of thinking which has been engendered must be exercised on something, and we have it seeking to ameliorate its condition by the reform of every thing old, and the introduction of new conveniences. Not only does the northern climate force exertion of mind and body, but that activity is more compatible with comfort. Exertion is the sure source of development of all the strong qualities of the mind—or rather the sourch of the development of all the physical powers from which a strong mind naturally proceeds. Besides, the exhilirating atmosphere of a cold climate is much more effective in strengthening mind than that of the tropics. Some writers are disposed to give such effect to this cause as to ascribe to it the different national traits of the inhabitants of Europe. The phlegmatic temperament of the English is ascribed to his fogs, and the vivacity of the French and Italian to their clear sunny skies. However this may be, it

will generally be admitted that the activity of the mind corresponds with the state of the atmosphere, and that that activity is greatest when the atmosphere is clearest. This effect of the climate may be seen more clearly in the literature of the people residing under the tropics, and in northern countries. In the latter thought is strong, terse and definite, while in the former it is dreamy, imaginative, allegorical, and strongly metaphorical. The exaggerations also, so familiar to eastern literature, and childish distortions, show mind in a weak state. The Revelations of St. John could never have been written by the inhabitant of a cold climate, any more than the Arabian Nights' Entertainments. Indian mythology, in all its huge deformity, could never have originated much less have been tolerated in a cold country. If the ancient mythology of the Scandinavian nations seem to contradict this, it may be said that this mythology surrendered to the first summons of Christianity, and never re-appeared after that great system was made known to the people of those nations.

On the whole, the climate of Canada, which is nearly the same over the entire country, is better fitted to generate those qualities which sustain nations than warmer latitudes, and to produce inhabitants superior in mind and body.

The population of the Dominion in 1871, was 3,485,761, and the addition of territory since will make it probably about four millions. We have seen of what this population is composed, what races make it up, and the effects which institutions, soil and climate have on its character. It only remains to be said, that this population occupy a territory as large as all Europe, with inexhaustible resources; that it carries on a trade, in proportion to its numbers, larger than England or the United States, and that it is the fourth maritime power in the world.

CHAPTER III.

The Future.

It is a fact well recognized by thinking men, that Canada cannot remain in her present position ; that the continued progress going on, even as at present, will force her to become something other than a colony. There are, however, only three possible states in which she can exist, in her present position of a colony of England, annexed to and forming a part of the United States, or as a separate and independent nation. Manifestly the first position cannot be maintained. In the career of all countries, there comes a time when the colonial position must cease, and when the former colony becomes absorbed in the mother land, or becomes independent. Every known nation at present in being, and every one ever recognized by history, has at first been a colony, or has passed through that condition. Indeed, there are well-known stages in the life of every nation, corresponding to that of infancy, boyhood and manhood in man. These may be called the settlement, the colonial position, and the nation, and these stages can be recognized in the careers or lives of the nations of ancient as well as modern history. In ancient history, the nation the most famous in war, in oratory and art—the nation which had the most influence or which had arisen to any great degree of civilization, was Greece. That this nation was once a colony, it is not necessary to prove. The same may be said of Rome, and nearly all the other nations of antiquity ; but the precedent which, at present, more particularly concerns the inhabitants of this country, is that of England—the motherland. No more striking instance of the growth of a nation from a colony to a first-class power can be found in history than in the case of England. At first the attempt to colonize the Island,

was made from Rome, and it is more than probable that the Romans laid the foundations of those great institutions which have since been the means of England's greatness. On the dissolution of the Roman Empire, the colony of Britain was abandoned, the legions which held the country being required at home to withstand the incursions of those colonists or barbarians which came pouring in from the northern nations. The Romans seem to have left the country much in the same state as they found it, with the exception of the gathering of the inhabitants into towns, which were the beginnings of the great cities which have since arisen. No one can doubt for a moment that the nations of the Heptarchy were simply colonies formed by different nations, such as the Saxons. The process was precisely similar to that which formed the thirteen colonies out of which the United States sprang. Evidence of this, however, is not so plain or so positive as that which exists in regard to the colonization of the United States, owing to the different times in which these colonizations were made; but the state of the two countries being almost identical, the inference is that this similarity was brought about by the same means.

That the condition of the two countries was nearly similar, the most cursory investigation will prove—making allowance for the difference in time and the degree of civilization. England was divided into seven independent districts, or, as the vanity of their half civilized rulers had them called, nations. These were governed by chiefs, who in process of time, and owing to the distance between them and the mother land of Germany, had grown from military chiefs into civil governors, and at the time of the Union of the kingdom by Egbert reigned as independent sovereigns. There is no difference between this position and that of the thirteen colonies of North America at the time of the Revolution, except that which the times in which the two nations were formed naturally account for. The colonies of America existed much in the same manner. Owing to the distance from the mother country, and the imperfect means of com-

munication, the governing influence of England had grown weak as in the case of Denmark, and the governors of the different colonies had lost a great part of the power which they originally possessed ; and, on the breaking out of the Revolution, it was found that their influence could muster very few men in aid of the rights of the crown.

No greater similarity could possibly exist than in this case ; but to the man who examines history in the light spoken of in the first chapter, this will not be surprising, as it is only in accordance with the great principle that history continually repeats itself.

Not only does the Saxon invasion or colonization of England show that the nation springs from the colony, as inevitably as the man does from the boy, but the subsequent invasion of the Normans proves it more conclusively, inasmuch as the facts having occurred in more modern times they are more susceptible of proof. The colonization of the Romans was abortive, as it did not tend to its regular results only incompletely ; the colonization of the Saxons was more successful, and the seed planted by them grew to maturity, and a nation was the consequence. This nation was overthrown, and the country was reduced again to the colonial position—at least the Saxon portion of it—by a people as alien to the inhabitants as the Saxons were to the ancient Britons, again showing how the occupation of a common country amalgamates alien populations, and produces a nation.

It is not necessary to recount the pretense under which William the Conqueror entered England. The will of Edward the Confessor was the only thing that gave his claim to the crown the semblance of right. His own great forcible brain and strong right arm, and the natural superiority of the Norman race over the Saxon, these, and these alone, gave him the right to the English crown, a right more respected then than it is now, as public opinion had not then the force it at present possesses. There are respectable authorities among English writers, who contend that the word

conqueror as applied to William is not to be taken in its literal meaning. Their national vanity is such that they have tried to manufacture a meaning for that word which will not imply subjugation. They say that the word conqueror means head feudatory, or the man who had the disposal of the lands. The victory at Hastings, however, was too complete to admit of the word being taken in any other meaning than the ordinary one. Not only was William a conqueror as regards England, but the conquest was more complete than any ever recorded. It is true that the men of Kent managed to retain a few of their ancient rights and privileges ; but all the customs of the country were totally and radically changed. The surrender of nearly all the lands in the kingdom into the hands of the king, and the granting again of such lands on conditions which put beyond belief the theory of a voluntary surrender, is the best proof of the completeness of the Norman conquest of England.

The conquerors did not look upon England for many centuries as their country. The incorporation of the Normans as a part of the English people, required many centuries to accomplish. The heaviest malediction which a Norman noble could utter upon himself was " may I become an Englishman," which goes to prove the wide difference which existed between the two peoples. However, the principles which promote the growth of nations fuse different peoples. When a country takes a position as a nation there is a common standpoint. Association in government, common interests, and national pride will not allow people in the same country to remain long divided, and, hence, the Normans and the Saxons, obeying involuntarily those great principles of cohesion, obtained more homogeneity, and grew into that nation which we love, and admire, and honor, under the appellation of the mother of nations.

It may seem trite to go over these commonplace events of history, and write so many things which some may deem nothing better than truisms and platitudes ; but it would seem from the theories which are abroad among the Canadian people, as if their force had been lost long ago.

Those same principles which obtained in the formation of England operated still more forcibly in the case of the United States, and are more vital to-day than they ever were, when railways and telegraphs bring the most distant parts of a country close together. There are men in our country, however, who have lived to an old age beside a country in which these principles have been constantly and rapidly operating—men who have seen even in their own lifetime the greatest power of modern times developed by their force, who will deny their existence. These are the men who endeavour to nullify their effect, but they are too powerful for their puny efforts. They exist, happily, unquenchable in the human breast, and must go on as continuously and as certainly as these great physical laws which govern the transmutations of matter.

If it be then certain that there is no stationary position for a people, the question arises, will these principles continue to run their legitimate and natural course in this country, or is there a prospect of their being diverted from that course? It is the opinion of many people that what is called a Federal Empire will be their result, and that that result ought to be an object of ambition to the Canadian people. It is difficult to define what is meant by this term, a Federal Empire. Even those who use it most have only a vague and indefinite idea of its meaning. However, it may be said to be a combination of the different colonies of England and England itself. Such combination to be held together by the loyalty and affection which are supposed to exist between them, and the common rallying point of the Crown. It is denied that the laws applicable to old countries are not applicable to new ones, but it is admitted that the colonies and the Mother Country have different climates, and that different climates invariably create different interests. These different local interests, however, are to be committed to the care of local governments, and the general interests of the whole—which are supposed to be identical—are to be committed to the charge of a Federal Parliament and the Crown.

This is what is meant, seemingly, by people when they talk about a Federal Empire; but the details of this arrangement are not given. The kind of colonies which are to be united, whether those having representative institutions only, or Crown colonies, the basis of the representation, the apportionment of taxes for the support of the Federal government, and the nature and power of the Executive, are all indefinite. It must be confessed that the scheme is exceedingly vague, and, supposing it practicable, the benefits to be derived from it, as doubtful. It is manifest in the outset, that the great dependency of India could never be included in such a scheme—the nature of its government, the character of its people, and the extent of the country, entirely precluding such a possibility; but, it might be said, that that dependency and the different Crown colonies could become the common property of the Federal Government, that is, England shall give up her exclusive right to the government of those countries—countries which she acquired at her own cost, and at the sacrifice of the lives of thousands of her own sons—and allow the people of other states who, although allied in sentiment, are as alien in customs, manners and habits as the people of any foreign state, to participate in the benefits to be derived from them. Is it reasonable to suppose that England could be induced to do this? It is not reasonable or at all probable. There is another view, however, which may be taken of this part of the scheme. India and the Crown colonies might be left to England alone. Then in that case, she ought to be at the expense of defending them. Now, the only source of her embroilment with European Powers is the defence of India. The aggressions of Russia in the East give a prospect that, before many years, England may be called upon to defend India from that quarter; as well as upon the West by the support of Turkey. What interests would the Confederacy have in such a conflict? Or by what right could England ask its aid?

Again, by what system would the basis of representation

in the Federal Parliament be settled? Would it be property or number of inhabitants? Would the representatives be elected by the people or appointed by the Colonial Government? If by the people, what would be the qualification of the voters, whether a modified qualification or universal suffrage. On either system, the people of England would have the vast majority. If the representatives were appointed by the Colonial Governments, which would no doubt be more or less under the influence of the Crown, there would be simply irresponsible government, as the appointees of the local governments would be those of the Crown. Add to this, that the place of meeting of the Federal Parliament and the seat of the Federal Government would be in England. The principle, under Parliamentary institutions, which is said to secure the purity of members, is the influence of public opinion, and the pressure of their constituents. How is this public opinion in Australia, or Canada, to influence the conduct of a member of the Federal Parliament in London, exposed, as he necessarily must be, to the fascinations of court, the hospitalities of society, and the corrupt influence of ministers. Even patriotism, the ordinary bond which strengthens and upholds a public man under temptation, is taken away; for, in such a wide extent as that supposed by a Federal empire, the feeling must be too diluted to have much force. Would it be safe to entrust Federal taxation to such a body? No doubt the sum to be contributed by each member of the Federation for the support of the whole, could be limited; but could the limitation of an individual member bind the action of the whole? If there be a Parliament, would it not be supreme, and if supreme, could it not abrogate all limitations? The right to tax Colonies has been given up by England since the American Revolution. The effort to enforce that right, in that instance, turned out so disastrously as to have never again been attempted. Since then protection has been given to Colonies without the power of taxing them. This protection, at present, is no doubt of a questionable kind; but real

protection was given to Canada in 1812, and the expense of that protection was never asked from us. It would have been unjust if it were asked, as the war was created by England, and Canada was not the cause of it. The protection extended to us is not from our own acts, but from those of England; and, therefore, we have a right to that protection so long as England thinks it necessary to her prestige or power to retain us. It is not likely that, under a Federal empire, any cause for war could come from us any more than now. Any cause for such a misfortune would no doubt arise from some injury done to an Imperial interest, and, if this so-called protection has been given for years without the right of taxation, would the Canadian people submit to taxation by going through the form of submitting the amount required, to be voted upon by representatives sitting in London? It is extremely doubtful; and it is more than probable that the first attempt to levy taxes in Canada, to be used for Imperial purposes, would be the signal for a war as fierce, bloody and expensive, as that of the American Revolution—a war, devastating in the present, but reaching in its effects to future generations, by the feeling it would generate. The voice of Canada could not be any more powerful in a Federal Parliament than it is now. There is no reason for supposing that the result of the Washington Treaty would have been different if such a Parliament existed. A Canadian Commissioner, in such a body, would have been just as powerless to obtain redress for Fenian grievances as was Sir John Macdonald. And there is no ground for thinking that Canadian representatives, in such a body, could have prevented the sacrifice of the Canadian fisheries in the interest of the Imperial Government.

The nature and powers of the Executive in the proposed Government would be a subject of the greatest difficulty. It may be supposed that the present principles of responsible government would be continued; and, if so, the Federal Cabinet must have a large majority of Englishmen proper. How would positions of emolument and trust in the different

countries be given? Would such positions be under the control of the representatives, or would they be given to the appointees of the local government. The probability is that there would be a system adopted, similar to that which obtained in the case of India, and that the Federal Empire would be a special preserve for the younger sons of the English aristocracy. The system pursued in the present English House of Commons, with regard to Scotland, might be followed. All things pertaining to Canada might be carried out according to the will of the majority of its members, and if that were done, then, as regards Canada, the whole scheme is unnecessary, as Canada expresses her wishes at present through a representative government.

It may be asked then, for what purpose, supposing it practicable, is all this cumbrous, complicated governmental machinery to be put in motion. The advocates of the system do not allege that it will advance the interests of Canada, but simply that it will preserve and protect a sentiment of attachment to the mother land which is said to exist among them. To listen to what is said on this subject one would imagine that the sentiment of attachment to one's country is confined to the inhabitants of the British isles. No one seems to think of an opposing sentiment that is springing up, just as natural and just as well placed.

The principles which give rise to patriotism or love of country exist in Canada as well as in England. According to their natural course these principles must increase in force as the country becomes a source of pride. There is a love of location which exists in the brute creation, to gratify which animals have been known to travel, guided by instinct, hundreds of miles. This same love exists naturally in man, in a much greater degree, but it is intensified by his feelings being more sensitive, his attachments more constant and unchangeable, and his affections more forcible. The house he was born in becomes an attraction to him from that fact alone. From the house this feeling expands with the growth of the sensations. The paths which

are trodden, the play grounds frequented, the schools attended, become objects of attachment and regard. The feeling increases with the growth of the passions. The trysting place, the fields through which he meandered entranced and sublimated by first love, the house, the scene of his nuptial joys and sorrows, and the birthplace of his children, are all taken in, and find a place in his affections which death alone can remove. Afterwards man's interests come into action. These carry him in the direction of his feelings, and extend his sentiments beyond the circle of his kindred. Association and common principles of action, induced by climate and similar circumstances, create a certain affinity of feeling that makes countrymen, and the antagonisms and preferences of states, consolidate all these into that feeling called patriotism which naturally exists in the bosom of the savage as well as the man of education, which may in the latter extend to a love for humanity in general.

This feeling of patriotism does not depend upon nativity. The mere birth, indeed, has very little to do with it. Governments used to claim allegiance on this ground, but the doctrine is exploded. If a country did nothing for a man but give him birth, he has little to be thankful for. That country in which his mind is formed is the one to which he owes allegiance. There are men in the different countries of Europe who have lived there a lifetime, whose instincts are not much better than those of the animals they tend. These men never know real enjoyment. Their labor from morning till night barely suffices to support existence, not existence, but that dread of death which keeps them and the lower animals alike from extinction. For what has such a man to be thankful? what is there to give him patriotism? he owes his country nothing but what she can extort. On the other hand, the country which shares with the parents the cares of childhood, which forms the soul and the mind by her school system, and afterwards by her institutions affords scope for the development of all the faculties which she has helped to create, and protects him in the enjoyments derived

from those faculties, this is the land to which that man is indebted, for whose welfare and safety he should be willing at any moment to give up that life which without its assistance would be almost valueless.

These causes also tend to make men in Canada who have been born in other countries patriotic, and lessen their love for their native land. The man who is brought from another country to this in infancy knows no other. His native land may be more beautiful and worthy, but never having seen any other than Canada, he is satisfied to give to her his affection and love. The man who immigrates in his manhood does so to better his condition. Although he cannot forget his native land he owes as much to Canada. Here by his labor he has amassed a competence, and here his mind has been improved, if not formed. The facilities afforded to every man have been taken advantage of, and the free institutions have completed what the schools and his own exertions have begun. Other causes through life spring up for loving the land of adoption. More than likely the partner of his toils, and the solace of his griefs and troubles has been obtained there. The home makes the country. No man feels himself permanently settled in life until he marries. This influence has a great effect, and it is increased by the birth of children. He, no doubt, endeavors to instil into those children a knowledge and a love for his native country, but nature is too strong for him. The tangible—the present is the source of attraction. He cannot satisfy the desire in their minds for a country by pointing to one three thousand miles away, however great it may be in learning and glory. Hence in time his children grow up with a love for Canada, and he unconsciously shares their feelings. As he grows older, the feeling which was so strong and fresh in his mind for his native land gets weaker, and, instead of wishing for his own land his only desire is for a spot to lay his bones in the scene of his labors. Hence, interest and sentiment combine to make Canadians of the people of the different nationalities which make Canada their home. The national societies which

are the result of the old love of course obstruct a good deal the power of these forces, and keep alive the affection for the native land, but these societies are not powerful enough to counteract the natural outflow of the feelings for Canada. But no one doubts that these societies ought to be done away with. They are upheld upon one ground, and that is the assistance they offer to the indigent immigrants of the different nationalities, when they first land upon our shores. An efficient immigrant agency in every large town, however, would do that duty better. The relief administered is not in any case extensive, and they are the means probably of making the Government inattentive and less careful of the wants of the newly arrived immigrant. On the ground of benevolence, also, these societies exist; but it is true there is a feeling of love for the old countries mixed up in them, and the tenacity of their members in clinging to those old absurd legends which are laughed at every year is wonderful. It cannot be because they believe in their truth. A few years in Canada dissipates any belief which may exist in the mind relative to these fables. It is more than doubtful if ever such personages as St. George and St. Patrick ever existed, not to speak of their famous exploits of killing dragons and expelling snakes and venomous reptiles—freaks of the imagination which runs riot in times of ignorance and superstition.

National societies if they did no more harm than preventing the formation of a Canadian sentiment might be tolerated, but when they are the means of bringing into the country the hatreds and prejudices formed in other countries they are pernicious. This may be said more particularly of Irish societies. The peace and harmony of the Canadian people should not be allowed to be disturbed by the feuds of Ireland. The careful reading of the history of that unhappy country will make any candid reader doubtful of those blessings which are said to follow the spread of Christianity. Since the so called conversion of that land from paganism to the repeal of the penal laws it has been the scene of

more slaughter, rapine and injustice than is to be found in Pagan history. It has been the volcano from which has flowed for many years streams of hatred and rancor. Education and time are the only remedies for the evil; and no doubt it will no more be able to stand these influences in Canada than in the Unites States. The effect of these evils can be seen in the different parts of the country. In the unsettled parts, where schools are scarce and the original immigrant is the sole inhabitant, old country prejudices are in the ascendant, causing a much ruder society than the state of the country would warrant; and preventing that mutual aid among settlers which is the great civilizing force in the western states. In the old settled parts of Canada religious differences are scarcely heard of, and if they are, they are more between the different denominations of Protestants than between the latter and Catholics. Public opinion, strongly directed against the foreign national societies in Canada, is the only preventive to their evils. The more patriotic this public opinion is, the more effectual it will be. As a means of creating and affecting public opinion in this respect, the formation of Canadian national societies has been attempted with considerable success.

For these various reasons, the sentiment which requires a Federal Empire is decreasing every day, while a sentiment with an opposite tendency is increasing. It is not probable that the inauguration of such an Empire could affect the natural laws which cause this result. Nationality lives on local patriotism. Patriotism, in a country scattered over the globe, is an impossibility. That foul weed communism grew up in the bosom of France, the most compact of all the nations of Europe. Communism saps the foundations of nationality by destroying local patriotism. If such a system could be possible in France, as it is now, how would it be with that nation, if it were composed of Corcicas in every quarter of the globe, as a British Federal Empire must necessarily be. Patriotism could not exist, and the nation would fall to pieces. The bond, consequently, which is to

hold together England and her colonies in one empire is but a rope of sand. The scheme was never recognized by statesmen as possible. It is the theme of dreamers and speculators only; and can only be ranked with that other beautiful but impracticable dream, the Utopia of Sir Thomas More.

CHAPTER IV.

Absorption of Canada by the United States.

In considering the probability of a country's being absorbed by one lying coterminous to it, three things have to be examined: first, the physical boundary which separates them; second, the nature, race, and principles, with their points of resemblance and difference, of the two peoples; and, thirdly, the character of their institutions and languages. There are many countries in the world, the independence of which is preserved by their physical boundaries; and to which they are indebted for their very existence. It may be said that the greater part of the nations of Europe have originated in this way. On the breaking up of the Empire of Charlemagne, from which the main features of the political geography of Europe may be dated, the division of the empire among that monarch's children was made seemingly according to natural boundaries. The Spanish peninsula is more noted in this respect than any other. Surrounded on all sides but one by the sea, and on that side separated from France by the Pyrenees mountains, it would appear that nature intended it for a separate national existence. The same may be said of Italy. Nothing has been so instrumental in the unification of that country, as the protection it has received from nature. Surrounded by water, except where protected by the Alps, it originally gave rise to that great race the Romans, and to their majestic language.

Indeed, all nations may be said to be indebted to the conformation of the land or to that of their territory for their existence. In primitive times, when means of communication consisted of beasts of burden and man's own locomotive powers

only, physical obstacles to intercommunication created isolation, and the peculiar habits, languages and customs of each isolated branch of humanity formed a distinct people or a nation. The effects of these natural boundaries were abolished by force of arms, in many instances; but, nevertheless, power was not able to efface those distinguishing traits which marked out the different communities formed by the natural conformation of the countries they inhabited. In modern times, when the idea of nationality has taken such hold on the peoples, and efforts are being made, by the distinguishing mark of language, to reform those nations dismembered by force of arms, it is found, in almost all instances, that the boundary between two languages is also a boundary formed by nature in the physical conformation of the country. Thus, in the case the most recent—the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine to Germany—where the German language ceases, and the French begins, there rise the Vosges mountains; shewing the original natural boundary between the two nations. The task of reforming the different nationalities from this reason has been comparatively easy. The different nations and states of Italy have been consolidated under one monarch, in half a lifetime, and without any of those great devastating wars which occur on the amalgamation of a country by an alien nation. Garibaldi united Italy with a mob; Bismarck requires a host of disciplined troops to unite Germany; but the efforts of Germany to re-unite into one Empire are being, and no doubt will eventually be entirely successful, from the fact that she has no great physical obstacles to overcome. Without, however, giving any further examples, it must be plain that where easy access is possible from one country to another, the chances of two such nations uniting must be far greater than where they are separated by large ranges of mountains, as in the case of France and Spain, or a large body of water, as is the case with regard to England and Ireland, which, from this cause, never will be really united.

If we examine the boundary between Canada and the

United States, we find that it is nearly wholly artificial. In a part of the line between the two countries, the great lakes make a good natural boundary; but this part is so small compared with the whole length of it, as to be inconsiderable. Besides, even in this part, the rivers connecting those lakes detract from the inaccessibility caused by them. But however formidable they may be as a natural barrier at the part where they separate the two countries, the chief part of the boundary is a mere imaginary line, offering no obstacle whatever to the unification of the two countries.

The people inhabiting Canada and the United States are of the same race. The time which has elapsed, however, since they have been living under different institutions, and the admixture of the people of many different nationalities with the original people of the thirteen colonies, have made many material differences between them. The extent of the United States also, admitting as it does of continual movement, prevents that condensation of character which is to be found in Canada. The superficiality of the American character is admitted by their best writers. One of them gives a good picture of their want of continuity by portraying a man who laid out a plan for a large house, put the frame up, enclosed it, and then moved to the Western States, leaving the house half finished. And this is not an exceptional trait, but a general one. It would be difficult to tell that such a people ever existed, if any dreadful calamity could by any possibility at present forestall the fate which time has in store for them. There is nothing in the country at present that would last one hundred years. Everything is done for the present, and the future must take care of itself. The future may be more substantial; but that future may be never reached. The character of the people is just as flimsy as their works; weak and shallow, satisfied with the gaudy and showy; without any interest in those studies which form strong traits, it tries to make up in vainglorious self-laudation what it lacks in strength. The qualities of energy, enterprise, and ingenuity, cannot be

denied to the American character; but the source of these qualities detracts from their merits. The man who exercises his energy and ingenuity only to find means for the gratification of his vices and passions is not worthy of much admiration. The pursuit of wealth is certainly commendable; but the desire for wealth, to the exclusion of every virtue, and regardless of every other object, is most debasing. This is the ruling passion in the United States, and to its gratification is sacrificed what men in all other countries hold dearer than life. Every public man, not excepting the highest, has his price, and if morality be effected it is only done to enhance the value. Hypocrisy is the tribute vice pays to virtue, and this accounts for so much sham being in vogue. To a stranger it is a matter of surprise how the ordinary relations and business of life are carried on. A contract is made, and if done through an agent it is favorable or unfavorable, according to the price paid the agent. You wish to purchase a house, and you consult your dearest friend as to the price. The price he names is paid, and you afterwards learn that he gets the third of it, which is that much over the value of the house. A lawyer is consulted, and takes your money to right this wrong, and also takes money from your opponent to betray you. If the lawyer will not do so, the judge or the arbitrator to whom the judge refers it will. If, however, these men turn out an exception, and the case be large enough, the whole State Legislature can be bribed to pass a measure annulling the law under which you acted, but whether it becomes law or not depends on the fact whether you are wealthy enough to bribe the Governor to veto it. This is the experience of the English stockholders in the Erie Railroad.

To those who have paid for the experience, and who have no scruple in giving up all notions of honor and honesty, this system may be well enough, as in the knowledge of the principle upon which every one acts is a safe guard; but to the man of honor, it is simply ruin. Every man tries to overreach his neighbor, and both endeavor to overreach

the State. When the moral sense is destroyed by processes of this kind, the family relations cannot long remain pure. The feeling of honor which gives way for pecuniary reasons in the every day business life, most come in the end to estimate the most sacred relations at the same money value. Hence the frequency of divorce, the disruption of families, and the universal corruption of boarding houses and hotels. In no other country has an effort been made to give public recognition to prostitution under the title of woman's rights.

How this state of morality has been brought about is not the province of the writer to try to ascertain, that it is so in the cities, the impartial observer must admit. In the country parts of the older states it is not so bad; but in the new states it is the case in town and country. This kind of morality is not that generated by the immoral characters of other countries who have made the United States their home. The class which strives to overturn the present social laws that govern all decent societies is native American. Very few foreigners will be found in the Oneida community of free lovers. These people are only the few who openly practise the doctrines they profess. In no other country could such an association exist, and its existence is a sufficient indication of the moral atmosphere by which it is surrounded.

The contrast presented to this state of morality by the Canadian people is immense. The decent observance of all the social virtues at least in public and by profession is notorious. The absence of any divorce law from the Statute Book is not only some proof of this public observance but also of the general state of the morals of the people. Law is the result of necessity or rather of the will of the people; and if the state of the people required it in such a democratic country as Canada, such a will would make itself manifest by the passing of such a law.

The contrast presented also in the business life of the two peoples is just as great. The desire to amass money and wealth is just as great in Canada as in the United States; but

the means employed are not nefarious, and they are always subordinate to the feeling of commercial honor. From the dealings of some Canadian merchants with English merchants this may not be so apparent. It must be remembered, however, in judging this, what standard is used. The English standard of commercial honor is an unusually high one. In the commercial circles of the United States of the highest class, the feeling which impels men to meet obligations may be just as strong; but the general morality in this respect is as much below that of Canada as it is below that of England. The general standard in the United States is limited only by personal safety. All that can be done within the strict letter of the law is right, while in Canada the people being more restrained in their general moral principles carry that restraint into their business, and are impelled by these principles to meet every engagement. Hence there are no corners in Canada except those which are caused and made by Americans. The interests of the country are never imperilled by the reckless gambling which seems to be a part of the legitimate business of the United States. Neither are the "rings" or monopolies which disgrace that country in vogue. Success never condones swindling, no matter how large the transaction may be, and the creation of an artificial stringency in any commodity for the purpose of enriching the few at the expense of the many is so much contrary to the general opinion of the country as to have hardly been attempted. In nothing, however, is the contrast in the business morality of the two countries so apparent as in the railway systems. The English "bubbles," which a few years ago caused such widespread misery in that country are the only projects which can be likened to the railway schemes in the United States. Half the lines of railway, owing to the system of land grants in aid of their construction, have been concocted and built for fraudulent purposes. The cupidity of the English people has been used and acted upon in the same manner, and the prospect of dividends to English stockholders, which every

year grows more remote, may eventually open the eyes of admirers of the United States in England to the true nature of American enterprise. Indeed, the three great elements of American business enterprise are almost unknown in Canada. Rings, corners, and fraudulent stock are things which the unsophisticated and "unenterprising" Canadians at present know nothing about; and their existence must always remain a mystery to them so long as the corrupt legislatures of the United States, based upon universal suffrage, which give these institutions strength and vitality, are impossible in their country.

The political institutions of the United States are in a great measure one of the main sources of the wide-spread immorality which prevails. The doctrine of universal suffrage is held by Canadians generally as being responsible for the most of it; but the fault or evil lies deeper. The right to vote being given to a man without property is not of itself an evil. Nothing seems more just than that the man who may be called upon to defend the country even with his life should have a voice in the government of it, although he may be more interested if a part of its territory be his own individual property. The main question, however, is not whether he has property or not, but whether his mind has been properly formed by education and religion to exercise the right to vote. Some may infer intelligence sooner in a man possessed of property than in one who has none. This inference might hold good in Europe; but not in Canada or the United States. Churches and schools in these countries are as accessible to the poor as they are to the rich, property consequently as a means of obtaining education and intelligence cannot have the same weight in this respect as in Europe. But its possession is said to be *prima facie* evidence of intelligence. It cannot be said, however, that the man who contracts his mind by concentrating it upon the acquisition of property, or the man who by continual labor and parsimonious habits, renders it sordid is more intelligent than the man

whose mind has not been influenced in this way. Neither can it be said, that the man who obtains his property by defrauding his fellows is any more intelligent than the man who barely makes his living by adhering strictly to the rules of probity and honor. The exercise of industry and sagacity is generally supposed to be the means of acquiring wealth ; and it may be probable that the man who makes the most money in this way evinces the most intelligence, but the race is not always won by the most deserving, and if wealth alone is to be taken as the only criterion, the highwayman and the robber are as much entitled to political privileges. as the man who has through a lifetime, by the practice of every virtue and the use of his talents, amassed a fortune. Besides these extreme cases, there is the great class who obtain wealth without any exertion of their own, who inherit it. It is likely that these are men of intelligence, but they may be fools. On the whole the property criterion is a very poor test, and the manhood suffrage of the United States would not be a bad foundation for government, nor lead to the results which we see flow from it there, if it were properly based, as it should be, on education and religion. As it is the want of religion and its total separation from public education which creates the evil, it may be proper to consider these subjects.

The educational system of the United States is esteemed by Americans as the best in the world. Its only object, however, seems to be the inculcation of secular information, and it may be said to secure all that can be legitimately expected when it has secured this result. Education as it is understood at present consists in learning the means of acquiring knowledge. The learning of these means may have the effect of disciplining the mind to some extent, but not any more than the learning of a trade or business. The mechanical operation of learning to read is not much different from that of learning to make a watch, and if the watchmaker after having obtained his knowledge were to do

nothing afterwards at his business, or make no use of his information, it would be about as sensible as the present method of education, which seems to be satisfied with acquiring those means of information, which, without being made use of, has not much more effect in training the mind than the mechanical business necessary to the watchmaker. However, a great object is obtained if the State place within the reach of every one the acquisition of these means, although the chances are just as great that these means may be employed for the purpose of destroying the mind as of benefiting it. In a country where the press is so free and subject to so little supervision as in the United States, the danger arising from its abuse is more imminent than in a country where it is subject to censorship. The mass of pernicious reading which teems from the American press cannot help having a deleterious effect on those capable of reading it, and whose taste has not been formed by any instruction whatsoever. In other countries this danger is averted by religion. Education and religion go hand in hand in forming the mind, and, while education provides the means of acquiring information, religion, and in some countries a rigid censorship of the press, provide that these means shall be made use of in acquiring the proper kind of information.

These two securities are totally wanting in the United States. Some religious societies lately, seeing the evils flowing from indiscriminate reading, have endeavored to stem the torrent of obscene literature, which is causing so much corruption, by enforcing the laws in existence against such publications, but so long as such efforts are left to the voluntary action of the moral part of the community they cannot effect much good. The vast difference which exists even in such a free country as England and the United States in this respect is seen in the fact that, while the American press has been pouring out over the whole country lately streams of obscenity in what is known as the Beecher Scandal, the matter would not even be allowed to pass over

the telegraphs of England, because a number of females were operators and might be corrupted.

The reading of the Bible in the public schools of the United States is another attempt to direct aright the tastes of the people. This practice is causing a good deal of commotion among the religious denominations. The Roman Catholics have taken their children away from the public schools entirely, in consequence of it. The promiscuous use of the Bible among children is in their opinion a very questionable practice. Indeed, the reading of that part of it called the Old Testament must aggravate the evil sought to be remedied instead of lessening it. It is not possible that the Old Testament would have ever been retained as a guide of morals by Christianity were it not for its necessity as shewing the want of atonement in the scheme of salvation. On this ground it is valuable, but very few will advocate the putting of such a book without proper safeguards in the hands of young children. How good, however, the Bible may be when attentively studied in the proper spirit, its formal reading, unaccompanied by any instruction, in the public schools can have very little effect in promoting good morals.

The religious beliefs of the United States prove the extent to which even an educated people can go in credulity and fanaticism. All manner of belief is rife among them, and all recognized forms of belief are split up into innumerable divisions. Under the pretense of freedom of conscience, villains of every description obtain wealth and position by the formation of churches and sects. The weakness, the credulity, the ignorance and the natural piety of the people are traded upon by men totally unfit for the sacred vocation ; and who by hypocrisy and deceit spend their whole lives in the indulgence of every vice. The extent of imposture, bounded by Shakerism on the one hand, which would destroy the race, by celibacy, and Mormonism and Free Love on the other, which would also destroy it by excess, is amazing. The Bible, torn to atoms by a thousand contending sects, is held to be the supreme guide and rule of faith; and, from this prolific

source, division after division and sect after sect have sprung, until now seemingly exhausted Spiritualism has thrown it overboard altogether. Actual communication with the spirit world, and guidance and admonition from thence, which seem to be the rule with this latter sect, is found, however, by experience to be uncertain also, and this new source of conflict and contention is likely to turn out as prolific of beliefs as the Bible itself. Amid this spiritual chaos are the numerous sects of unbelievers. These are extremely active, but they only pull down. They shew the absurdity of every belief without supplying any substitute, and, as a consequence, they add to the vast stream of immorality.

Such being the position of religion, but little control can be had by it over the morals of the people, while it cannot reach the children at all except by the Sunday school. The beliefs implanted in children are apt to wear; but the religious instruction of one day in the week is likely to be obliterated by the secular studies and sports of six. One-half the people of the country attend no place of worship whatever. This portion of the population having no moral guide at all may be said to be indifferent, and are satisfied with the morality supplied in the schools.

From all this it can be easily understood how the religion and education of the United States are not sufficient to guide the people in the use of their political rights. The moral principles ought not only be sufficient to withstand evil but to do right. Voters are surrounded by all kinds of temptations. The arts of the briber and log roller are nowhere carried to such perfection, while intimidation either drives the people from the polls or withstands right.

The vast influx of foreigners also tend to the universal corruption. Possessed of the franchise long before they know any thing of the politics of the country, they are simply instruments in the hands of designing men. This influx, in comparison with the population, may be deemed

small, but, like the influx of small rivers into larger ones, although they make no perceptible difference in the volume of water, they tinge its color.

One of the strongest arguments in favor of universal suffrage is that it remedies its own defects because the exercise of its privileges educates and ennobles the people. The experience obtained in the United States does not lead to this result as yet. Perhaps if ever the time should come when the exodus from Europe should cease, its advantages in this respect may be more apparent; but at present it may be said with truth to be the source of most of the corruption which is eating into the heart of the United States, and which threatens at no distant day to engulf the whole nation.

The chief difference between Canadian and American institutions is in this: the Canadian franchise is a limited one, restricted to property-holders and house-holders. It may be that the people of Canada might extend the suffrage with advantage. The giving of political rights to all tax-payers might be attended with success, as well as being in accordance with the dictates of justice. All consumers are tax-payers to a certain extent, but some qualification ought to be exacted as a safeguard for the safety of the State. The receipt of an income, whether as shewing the benefit the State derives from the labor of the individual, or the amount he pays in taxes, might be taken as a qualification, and to this might be added the ability to read and write and subjection to military duty. The oath of allegiance to the State, which ought to be exacted from every foreigner, should also be required. These concessions might be made with advantage, and in all probability will be made before long, but even then there will and must be a wide difference between the Canadian institution and that in the United States; and even if the manhood suffrage be introduced into Canada, the moral power of her people is sufficient to enable them to use it properly and prevent it from becoming the evil it is in the United States. The ballot is now added

to Canadian institutions. The utility of this principle, as allowing the free exercise of opinion to the voter, is now unquestionable. It is to be regretted, however, that our dependent position did not allow us to adopt it years ago, instead of having to wait until it was introduced into the mother country.

Another material difference in the institutions of the two countries is the nature of their administrations and governments. The principles upon which Republican governments are based are that all power is derived from the people, that that power returns to the people periodically, and that rulers are continually responsible to the people. The constitution of the United States is supposed to be based on these principles; but in some material particulars it is opposed to some of them. The ruler of the United States or the president is elected for four years, and during this time he is not continually responsible to the people. He is liable to a certain extent by impeachment; but this, as its punishment is only removal from office, after being found guilty by the senate,—which, with the power in the hands of the president, is almost impossible—cannot be said to be much of a security. The cabinet of the president being the heads of the great departments are removable only by the president. The susceptibility of the government to the will of the people as expressed by their representatives, which is the main characteristic of the English system of government, is entirely wanting in that of the United States. This want of power over the Executive is said to be made up by the separation which exists between the Legislature and the Executive—the duty of the president being confined to the execution of the laws only; the yearly session of Congress, and the elections to the House of Representatives being held every second year, together with the power vested in Congress to pass a law over the president's veto by a two-thirds vote, being sufficient control by the people. The experience of the presidential term before the present one, however, goes

to prove that a president opposed to a majority of the representatives may do a great deal of damage to the interests of the nation without committing any of those serious acts which would require the extreme measure of his removal by impeachment; and that, even when those more serious acts have been committed, removal by impeachment is not easily effected. It consequently happens that laws passed by both Houses of Congress may remain a dead letter for four years. If the immense patronage, and the influence of the Executive over the two Houses, be taken into consideration it may easily be supposed how difficult it must be in many instances to obtain the necessary two-thirds vote to override the veto of the president. The commotions and disturbance caused by the conduct of Andrew Johnston during his incumbency of the office of president are a sufficient proof of the irresponsible power wielded by a president, and the damage flowing from the exercise of such power, even in a limited manner. It follows, therefore, that the president of the United States is not continually subject to the will of the people—nay, even more, he may during his term of office oppose that will in such a manner as to render it almost non-effective.

The contrast between the Canadian and American Governments in this respect is striking, and very unfavorable to the latter. Under the Canadian system the Executive is continually under the control of the people, and susceptible to their will. The Government of Canada is simply a Committee of the House of Commons. The policy of this Committee must always be supported by a majority of the House, and the influence of the people is so paramount that a majority of one of their representatives against the Government is sufficient to cause its resignation. Not only is this the case, but not one member of the Government can possibly retain his place but by first submitting his action in becoming a member of it to the direct vote of his constituents, so that the members of the Government are not only subject to the vote of the people's representatives but also to the voice of

the people themselves. This is the rule, but there are exceptions. Members of the Upper House or Senate who are appointed by the Crown, may be members of the Government, but the defeat of the Government in the Lower House is as conclusive to them as to the members of the Lower House. As, therefore, the existence of the Government rests almost exclusively with the Lower House, its strength in that House must be always maintained by having the largest number of its members there.

When it is understood that the whole policy of the country, initiation, passing, and execution of all laws and in fact the government of the nation, with the exception of a few prerogatives belonging to the Crown, well and carefully marked out, are in the hands of the Government, it will easily be seen how entirely the will of the people continually rules the country. It is possible that in the intervals between the sittings of Parliament some acts may be done by the Government not consonant to the will of the people, but intervals can never be more than a year, while the extreme penalty of death for arbitrary acts done, even in the name of the Executive, may be inflicted on ministers by impeachment. The veto power, which in the hands of a president of the United States may do such irreparable damage, is in the hands of the Canadian Executive entirely innocuous. The policy that every Government will pursue must be notorious to the Executive before they are called to office. The Government must be carried on by men having a majority of the people's representatives. If the Government fail for attempting to pass an obnoxious measure, or not initiating a required one, the calling to office of the opponents of the defeated Government, which must be done if the Government of the country is to be carried on, is an approval of their policy by the Executive which must always dispense with the veto power. The veto, under the system of responsible government, is nearly impossible with respect to an important measure, otherwise the Government could be carried on by a minority of the House of Commons; for if a

measure has passed both Houses, it must be done by a majority, and if such a measure be vetoed it involves the resignation of the Ministry and the calling to office of their opponents, that is the minority. This, as a matter of fact, can be done, but it relegates the question to the actual decision of the people as the Ministry must go to the country. If the new Ministry be not supported by the country, the Executive must submit or create a revolution.

In this respect, consequently, there is a radical difference in the two systems of government—a difference which seems fair to suppose to be irreconcileable to Canadians. Other features of the two governments are antagonistic.

The Executive of the United States is elected every four years by the people indirectly. This periodical upheaval of society so frequently, upsets the business of the country, affects the stability of the Government, and engenders animosities among the people. It also frequently carries with it a total change in the policy of the country; and the change in the policy is usually accompanied by a change in all governmental officials. These number 60,000. The loss to the public service by the expulsion of such a number of trained men, and the employment of an equal number unused to the routine of office, must be severely felt. Beside the material loss, the moral loss must be much greater. This periodical battle for the spoils of office, which takes place every four years, under the pretense of principle, must eventually tend to the extinction of patriotism, and the degradation of the nation. As the severity of the contests increases, the men engaged in them become inferior. The step between George Washington and U. S. Grant is immense, and the difference between the politics and the politicians of the time of the former and that of the latter is just as great. Under the system of responsible government those evils are avoided. It is a misnomer to call a government a monarchy when only a semblance of power is attached to the ruler as is the case in Canada—it is only a semblance of power, for even his prerogatives are exercised by the ministers. The personal influence of the

ruler may be great; but this is lessening. Personal loyalty is not so much in vogue as when the safety of the state and the security of the people depended on the strength and ability of the ruler. Loyalty now means devotion to the country and its institutions, and in a certain extent to the Sovereign as personifying these. A king is not necessary to responsible government. The head officer of the Executive might be termed governor just as well, the only thing necessary is security that the office shall not become vacant by death, or otherwise; and this could easily be done by having the ruler's successor always ready to fill his place, which successor might as well be the incumbent of an inferior office as an eldest son. Indeed, much better, as the person who would be capable of filling the next office to that of ruler would be sure to be a man of ability, while an eldest son might be a fool or a lunatic. The divinity that hedges a king is unknown in Sweden. If ever the system be tried in Canada, independently of any other power, the term governor or chief magistrate is the only one that can be used.

The appointment of judges in the United States is another feature of the government of that country which presents a strong contrast to the manner in which the same thing is done in Canada. The judges of the Supreme Court of the United States are appointed by the president with the approbation of the Senate, but the judges of all the inferior Courts are elected by the people. This system is more repugnant to the people of Canada than any other American institution. The people can be so little acquainted with the qualifications necessary for the office of judge, or whether the person for whom they are asked to vote is possessed of these qualifications, that it seems monstrous that they should be intrusted with this power. Judges should be entirely independent of popular influence. The judge who owes his position to a clique or party, and whose interest it is to keep that position, cannot be disinterested in his decisions. Many judges in the United States spend their first term in creating friends for the next election. The salaries are also

so small, the temptation to make a corrupt use of the office is very great. The evils arising from an elective judiciary have been demonstrated in the State of New York in the case of the Tammany frauds and the litigation concerning the Erie Railroad. The corruption exposed has been the cause of the removal of two judges from the Bench which they disgraced.

In civil matters, bad as elective judges are, they might be tolerated, but in criminal matters the consequences must be fearful. The contest which arises on the election of a judge is just as keen as in the election of other officers; and it is only reasonable to expect the same scenes of violence and disorder. As humanity is at present constituted, it is impossible to suppose that the man elected is indifferent to the means which are adopted to secure his election. And hence, his power is likely to be used to screen aggressors on his own side, and to punish his opponents. To expect complete justice for a prisoner taken up for election rioting from the man against whom he acted indirectly in committing the offence, is a stretch rather too far for credulity. The days of the old Romans are long gone by, and the man who calculates on the usual exercise of the passions is most likely to be correct. To make matters worse in the elective system, if that be possible—when the judge has learned enough of his duties to become efficient, his term expires, and he gives place to another man who goes through the same amount of bungling, and who gives rise to increased litigation by incorrect judgments. In this respect, the Canadian system is superior. The object of that system is to make the judges as independent as possible. With this object they are all appointed by the Executive, and cannot be removed except on the address of both Houses of Parliament; and every means is taken to guard them against all corrupting influences. The consequences are that very few instances of corruption are recorded of the Canadian Bench, while in the Province of Ontario there is no instance of it.

The laws of the two countries have the same basis—the Common Law of England. This has been altered and added to, to suit the wants and emergencies of new countries. In Canada a spirit of progress in law has been more manifest than in some of the States. Both countries, however, are very far behind. No codification has ever been attempted in either, (with the exception of the Province of Quebec,) which says very little for their lawyers and legislators. In some of the Western and Southern States, the old English procedure which was abolished in Canada in 1856 is still in existence. The criminal laws of both countries are much the same. Instead, however, of progressing in Canada in this particular, a retrograde movement has lately commenced. The abolition of unusual and inhuman punishment for criminal offences was a reformation effected in English law at the close of the last century; but these punishments continued to be inflicted in the United States, and to remain in the law with the rules of the English law which the emancipated colonists retained. And even to this day, although the pillory has been abolished, the use of the lash for petty offences is still retained in Deleware, Maryland and Virginia. The existence of slavery in those States until a recent date will account for this.

In Canada, however, this kind of punishment was scarcely ever known. In the early days of its settlement laws inflicting such punishments may have been on the Statute Book; but they were never enforced, and they were subsequently entirely abolished. On the consolidation of Canadian criminal law, after confederation, the friends of progress were astonished to find the lash re-introduced. The offence for which whipping is inflicted is not prevalent, and the re-introduction of the pillory or the rack would not have created any more surprise. Assaults on children under twelve years of age with a criminal intent are now punishable by whipping. When it is considered that in criminal cases the laws of evidence have not yet extended to giving the prisoner the right of being examined under oath, it will be seen that

this law exposes the best men in the country to the lash without a chance of vindicating himself, while the offence may be proven by a child who may be ignorant of the nature of an oath altogether. In cases, however, where guilt is proven beyond a doubt, experience both in the army and elsewhere has proven that the punishment of the lash, like all barbarous punishments, defeats its own end, makes brutes of human beings, and disgraces the country where it is used.

Religion in the two countries is much in the same position as respects its relation to the State. There is no established church in either country, and the voluntary principle is the prevailing one. In the United States all religious bodies are independent except the Roman Catholic—that is, they possess in themselves full authority for their government. Very few of the religious bodies in Canada have this power—the Roman Catholic Church as usual being governed from Rome, and the other denominations being connected with the parent churches in England and Scotland. The English Episcopal Church is said to be independent, but it is only the other day they received a Primate from England. The Methodist Church, however, has succeeded in becoming independent, and will no doubt experience in increased freedom of action great benefit. Its vitality and efficiency must be vastly increased. It only remains to be seen whether it will, by strongly identifying itself with the country, fulfill the great destiny evidently in store for this Church in Canada.

The language and chief literature of the two countries are the same. Among all the means for assimilating two peoples there is none so effective as the using of the same language. Contiguity has very little effect so long as the moral boundary created by a different language has an existence. When this has no existence thought becomes identical; and, when the thought of two countries is shaped by a common model, separation cannot long continue. English literature is this common model for the United States and Canada. All the leading minds in both countries have been formed by it. Canada has lived exclusively on it, owing to

its backwardness and the impossibility of forming a literature of its own for the want of that wealth which gives its possessors the leisure to write or those institutions of learning which form writers.

In the United States English models have been used in all the best of American literature. Washington Irving and Fennimore Cooper have copied Scott; Saxe is an echo of Thomas Hood; Prescott has adopted as nearly as he could the style of Goldsmith's Histories; while that universal toady, N. P. Willis, has copied every one. It is true that there is a new school of American literature springing up; but it is questionable if it will last during the present generation, and it is certain that it does not deserve to be perpetuated. Writers such as Mark Twain, Bret Harte, Artemus Ward, Josh Billings and Colonel John Hay are evidently doomed to extinction during the lives of present living men. When this burlesque on literature is forgotten, the great monuments of English thought will again have their effect, and continue to make the leading minds in Canada and the United States similar and congenial.

Add to all these moral forces which are imperceptibly drawing the two countries nearer together, the material bonds which are being forged every year in the shape of railways, bridges, tunnels, and business relations. The real termini of all Canadian railways are American cities. Detroit and Portland are the termini of the Grand Trunk, Detroit and Buffalo of the Western, Southern, and Air Line railways. The Goderich and Brantford railway also terminates at Buffalo. There was a chance that in course of time the termini of these roads might be in Canada by the increase of Fort Erie and Windsor; but this hope is now entirely out of the question, as the International Bridge at Buffalo and a projected bridge at Detroit will always continue these places as termini of the railways. Canadian canals also are more used by the Americans than Canadians, and from that people is expected the chief part of the tolls by which they are sustained. And this American business will be doubled by the enlargement of the Welland Canal

now going on. The investment of American capital is also increasing. The chief part of the lumber operations of the country is carried on by Americans, while the petroleum and mining interests have been entirely developed by them. What with these different connections the smallest fluctuation in gold on Wall street, New York, is felt all over the country, while Mr. Seward with a stroke of the pen a few years ago was able to paralyze all Canadian business. The United States markets in a great measure rule Canada; and a large share of her produce is disposed of there, but the duties imposed on the frontier take the most of the profit out of the Canadian and place it in the American Treasury. Many Canadians cannot be made to understand that a great share of these duties is paid by the consumer, and hence they attribute the pecuniary loss on their products to the national boundary and wish for its effacement. These men say that situated as Ontario is on the great track between the East and West, and so contiguous to eastern markets, all she wants is free access to these markets to become the wealthiest portion of North America. It is said a Reciprocity Treaty would answer this objection, but if it would it would increase a thousandfold the bonds which, in the shape of business relations, bind Canada to the United States.

On the whole the want of natural boundaries between the two countries, the common race, nature, and language of the two peoples, the similarity of their laws and institutions in substance, with some few striking exceptions, and the material connections which are being made every day, lead irresistibly to the inference that, unless something be done to prevent it, the absorption of Canada by the United States is only a question of time. Canada is unconsciously sliding down an inclined plane, the end of which is complete extinction as a separate nation. Her adoption of a Federal constitution almost similar to that of the United States proves this; and this constitution must approximate every year closer to its model, as the influence of the great Republic, which is felt and respected in the most remote quarter of the globe, must tell with double force on its nearest neighbor.

CHAPTER V.

Independence.

Patriotism is that feeling which prompts men to love their country better than any other portion of the world, and which gives the desire to see that land honored and respected among the nations of the earth. It is a feeling that in all ages has been highly esteemed among men, and has no doubt been mainly instrumental in raising man to his present position of intelligence. The spirit of emulation which this feeling creates tends to make each people wish to surpass all others, and to place their particular country above all others, in war, commerce, glory, and in the useful arts from which men derive comfort and happiness. In obedience to its dictates, millions of men have laid down their lives, and no feeling or passion of the race seems to be more ineradicable. Ages of oppression have no effect on it, indeed tyranny seems to give it life, and it moves and lives by opposition. All the heroes of antiquity were led by its sacred voice, and there is scarcely an action in human annals worthy of commemoration that cannot be traced to its inspiration. Under its extreme influence death, instead of having its usual dread, is an honor to be sought, and all the usual objects which make life desirable have been contemned in its cause. The rack, the dungeon and the gibbet have been tried in vain; it survives all torture and punishment, and burns brightest in the midst of misfortune. History is but the record of its feats, and man in the depths of ignorance has preserved his superiority to the brute creation by its nobleness and disinterestedness. It was this sentiment that raised Rome to the summit of earthly power, and the words of one of the greatest poets of that nation, that "it is sweet and glorious to die for one's

country," be they repeated never so often, cannot be made ridiculous, as they are the expression of the thoughts of thousands to day as they were in the time when they were uttered. This is the sentiment that sustained the three hundred at Thermopylæ to withstand the Persian host, that nerved the Swiss pikemen at Morgarthen to withstand the matchless squadrons of Austria, that preserved Scotland at Bannockburn, that enabled the bare-footed continentals to brave British troops, that enabled France to conquer Europe, that has raised Prussia, surrounded by foes, from a dukedom to the greatest empire on earth, and that has preserved Swiss nationality for ages in the midst of a continent surrounded by nations speaking the same language as its own people. The spirit of patriotism when once firmly established seems to be unquenchable. Scotland though lying for centuries alongside of the stronger nation of England, and with only an imaginary boundary, could neither be coaxed or conquered into giving up its independence, until one of her own kings united the two countries under one crown. Through eight centuries of oppression and slaughter, the embers of nationality kept alive in Ireland, and even now these embers glow as brightly as ever. All the power of the three greatest monarchies of Europe has failed to exterminate the national feeling of Poland. It is true that many of the nations of Europe have originated and have been preserved by love of power on the part of their rulers, but this passion in the Sovereigns could have effected but little without the patriotism of the people sustaining them.

Since, therefore, this feeling of patriotism has been so instrumental in forming and preserving nations in Europe, why should it not have the same effect in America. In one instance, on this Continent, it has operated with its usual force and success. At the time of the American Revolution there was very little nationality in the thirteen colonies; their greatest desire was to participate in all the glories in what was then called the Great Empire of Britain. So much

was this the case that there was no such thing as Confederation until that measure was forced upon them as a defensive one. The eagerness and loyalty with which the then colonists assisted the mother country in her wars with France prove the love and affection they bore her. There was not much feeling among them for their own land, as its divisions did not admit of much local patriotism. The inhabitants of Rhode Island, for instance, had not much to be proud of at that time, any more than the inhabitants of British Columbia before Confederation. Local jealousies, different interests and legislatures, and opposing tariffs, kept the people apart. The Revolutionary war, at its commencement, was the mere effort of the traveller to withstand the highwayman, as there was no common country; but eight years of common effort and common danger fused the materials and originated that spirit of nationality which thirty-five years of independence had so strengthened as to enable the country to cope successfully with the mother country again in the war of 1812. This war proves more than anything else what independence had done for the United States. It is true a large party was against it, but the national and patriotic spirit of the people sustained their government through it. The strength of this spirit was shewn some years before in the resistance that was offered to the demands of France. This national spirit then, has sustained the American nation through many severe trials, as well as other nations in Europe, and the older the United States get the stronger it grows in intensity.

Now, independence would do the same thing for Canada that it has for the United States. It would create a nationality which would unite the people as one man against all encroachments by the United States, and effectually prevent the absorption of the country by that power. Nothing but independence can ever avert this misfortune, which like a black cloud continually overhangs the country. Let not the ignorant prejudices of Scotchmen and others in favor of their native countries hide this from Canadians. There are

many who do not consider absorption by the United States as a misfortune; but look upon it as a blessing to be wished for. These are, in the main, citizens of the United States who have settled in Canada, and the children of such citizens; but there are a few Canadians proper who hold the same opinion. These degenerate people would be willing to give up the hope of a great nationality of their own for the position of a minor state in the American Union, a position not much better than that of conquered provinces. There was a time when annexation did not mean this, when the Federal authority of the Union was little better than a myth, and each individual State was superior to it, but that time has gone by for ever. The civil war completely destroyed the doctrine of States rights and centred in the Federal Government almost despotic power. If annexation should take place, Canadians for a short time might preserve control of their country; but that control must soon pass from their hands. The flow of population, which would necessarily begin from the States, would soon give all power to the strangers. Plain illustrations of this are now taking place in the Southern States. The carpet-baggers and negroes have taken all power out of the hands of the original owners, and are reducing, by rapacity and robbery, former flourishing communities to beggary and destitution. Appeals from the suffering people to the supreme power at Washington are stifled before they reach the ears of the Executive by interested parties, or if they do reach that high source of justice, mercenary motives prevent justice from being done. If in despair the oppressed people endeavor to obtain by aggrarian association protection from their destroyers, they are met by ferocious and blood-thirsty laws, such as the Ku-Klux act, which are enforced with vindictive cruelty by an undisciplined soldiery. The advocates of annexation say this is an exceptional state of things, and results as the necessary consequences of the late war. But let this be supposed, Canada by her separation escaped all the horrors and evils of that unhappy struggle. Had she been one of the States

of the Union before that unhappy conflict, she would now be burthened by millions of debt, her people would have had the years of mourning and tribulation for lost ones murdered through bungling and incompetency which are not yet over for the people of the Northern States.

There is no guarantee that another civil war will not occur just as disastrous as the one just ended. In 1854, when the Americans were publicly rejoicing over the losses of England in the Crimea, there was not so much prospect of an internecine struggle as there is now. The abolition of slavery has not settled all matters in dispute among the American people. The people can abolish almost all things, but they cannot do away with differences in climate. So long as the heat of the Tropics and the cold of the North produce different commodities and influence man's character differently, there must be danger from civil war in the United States. Many years before the question of slavery had culminated in bloodshed, the people of the North and South were on the brink of civil strife from this cause. The nullification agitation in South Carolina stopped little short of war. That state passed laws contrary to those of the general government, and called out her militia to enforce them, and war was only averted by the sagacity of General Scott. The same question is looming up again. The great States of the West are getting impatient under eastern taxation, and demand free trade. And it is more than probable this question, combined with the general laxity and corruption of the people, and a desire for the spoils of office, will bring on another civil war before three more presidential terms are over. When the struggle commences, Canada may look for a great accession of territory, or the complete destruction of the New England States. Their proximity to the Dominion, and the Conservative character of their people, will induce them to join it, if the terrors of a Federal army do not prevent them from doing so. Not only the climate but the character and nature of the soil has a great deal to do with peace or war. The comparatively barren soil of New Eng-

land cannot compete in agriculture with the fertile plains of the West, and, as a consequence, New England is engaged chiefly in manufactures. Agriculture, however, pays best in the West, and the people will not go into manufactures. The people of the East desire to sell their manufactures to those of the West, and, to prevent foreign competition, desire high tariffs. For a contrary reason, and to obtain cheap goods, the people of the West desire low ones or none at all, and as the precedent has lately been established that as the last resort a question may be settled by the sword, it is probable that this is the only arbitrar that can settle this tariff question.

To avoid participating in the future of the United States, independence is highly expedient for Canada. Indeed, this cause alone ought to induce those who have the interest of the country at heart to ponder the subject carefully and seriously. Believers in the great destiny of the United-States will see no danger ahead for their model government. Those who are most impressed with that destiny unfortunately have a great deal to do in shaping the destiny of Canada; but, as "distance lends enchantment to the view," it is to be hoped that a nearer inspection will dissipate the erroneous notions held by English statesmen respecting the United States, and enable them to assist Canada in securing a separate political existence.

The weakness of Canada at present consists in the differences among her people, caused by different nationalities and different religions with no common standpoint of union. In such a position the different peoples look to their respective native countries, and give to them their love and affection, and simply call Canada their home. All that Canada can expect, when her interests are at stake, is indifference. This is the feeling in question where Canada alone is interested, but when the interest of their native lands is involved the old feeling revives, and they are ready to betray the land of their adoption. The recent history of Canada proves these two positions beyond dispute.

The English right of sovereignty over Canada was acquired by conquest. However much may be said against this means of acquisition in a moral point of view, it is admitted among nations to give a good title. If countries, however, were to remain in the same position in which they are left after the conquest, the right would not be worth disputing. The Province of New Brunswick, for instance, was acquired in a wild state, and by the exertions of the people who settled there it was made valuable, and the question is who owns the Province, the English Government or the people who by their toil made it inhabitable. A Canadian statesman has lately decided this question. It has been asserted in the Canadian House of Commons without reproof or contradiction that the English Government had the power of taking the whole country and handing it over to the United States, or doing what they pleased with it without consulting the inhabitants, and, instead of grumbling at their taking the fisheries, Canadians ought to be thankful that they did not take the whole. In this instance England was directly and materially interested, and the power of affection for the mother land as against the interests of the adopted one was never better evidenced.

Instances of the former position, that where Canada only is interested indifference is the only feeling manifested by the people, are found in the settlement of the New Brunswick boundary and that of the North West. In the latter case, England was chiefly interested, as the Americans had threatened war, and Canada had then no rights over nor were there people in the territory itself. No doubt the chief parties interested, the share-holders in the Hudson's Bay Company, were amply recompensed for whatever they lost. But in the case of New Brunswick the case was different. There an unfounded claim was made by the Americans, and, owing to the ignorance and carelessness of the English commissioner, the claim was allowed, and a large portion of the Province was quietly ceded, the

people of the Province calmly looking on without a word of protest, and manifesting that utter indifference which people without a country show to the spoliation of their territory.

This spoliation is still going on. Only a short time ago the English Government attempted to make a treaty with America, but the attempt was unsuccessful. It would be beneath her dignity to initiate negotiations again on the same subject. An old question which had been in dispute some time between the two countries, but which had long been in abeyance, was seized upon as a pretext to re-open negotiations. The Colonial Government of Canada received an intimation to move for a settlement of what is known as the headland question, that is, whether the three miles of sea which washes the shores of Canada were to be measured from a line drawn from headland to headland where there were indentations in the coast, or from the shore. Although this had been determined on as a means of re-commencing negotiations, a minister was sent from Canada to urge the British Government to move in the matter. Accordingly a proposition was made to the American Government to settle the matter, but they refused unless the Alabama claims were to be settled also.

This condition was accepted of course by England, as it was the sole object of the transaction, and thus a most important Canadian interest was submitted to four foreigners, whose interest it was to obtain the best terms for their own country by the sacrifice of Canada. The result obtained is such as might be expected. The English difficulty is settled while the settlement of the Canadian question is just as remote as ever. Not only is this question not settled, but the Canadian fisheries have been given to the Americans with the island of San Juan as a part of the price of the settlement of the Alabama claims. Independence, and independence alone, will put an effectual stop to this spoliation; without it, it will continue. All old difficulties between England and America have been settled for the present, but no one can suppose that

new ones will not arise between two nations that are straining every nerve for the commercial supremacy of the world. It is said that Canada was interested and will continually be interested in preserving the peace between the two nations, as her territory would be the theatre of any war which might break out between them, but this is only a stronger argument for severing the connection. If Canada is only retained by England for the purpose of settling her difficulties with the United States, and paying by its territory for wrong done, from which wrong no one but the inhabitants of England derive any benefit, surely it is suicidal for Canada to wish to retain the connection. If the Alabama, which was constructed in England, took all or nearly all trade from the American marine and transferred it to England, as claimed by the Americans, it is difficult to understand by what law of justice Canada should contribute even the least to Alabama losses. Being a nominal part of the Empire could not render her liable. Had she been an integral portion and shared in the benefits derived by the English shipowners from the depredations of the Alabama, there might be an apparent show of justice, but, as it is, there is none.

It would also seem that Canada is to be held a part of the Empire when it subserves the interest of England, and not a part when it would be inimical to those interests to hold her so. In settling the Alabama claims she is a part of it; but in seeking redress for Fenian outrages she is not. Both of these grievances—the cession of the fisheries and the loss occasioned by the Fenians—have been inflicted on Canada, not for any causes arising from herself, but simply and solely from being connected with England. This is peculiarly the case with respect to the Fenian raids. According to the theory that Canada is an integral portion of the Empire, she would be as much entitled to protection by Imperial troops as one of the counties of England; but it turns out that she must protect herself, alone and unaided, from the consequences of the acts of England. There is no cause of difference between Canada and the Irish race. Canada has been

an asylum for the expatriated sons of that unfortunate land since its settlement. Neither are its people responsible for the actions which give rise to Irish hatred to England; for these acts were committed long before any of them were born, and if any responsibility remained it was thrown off by immigration, which prevented them from being able to redress any grievances which remained, or from any benefits which might be obtained as inhabitants of England from the treatment Ireland received. The long ages of English oppression which have generated Irish hate can in no way be attributed to Canada, but these people in their blind fury made the slender connection which exists between the two countries the pretext for harassing and murdering Canadians, and England refused either to share the expenses of repulsing them or to interfere to obtain redress or to prevent the recurrence of the violence. This is not strictly correct. She sent James Anthony Froud to the United States to assist in forming a better state of opinion; but whether he will succeed in doing this, or in exasperating the Fenians into another attack, is a question which time alone can decide. To all the protestations of Canada in these matters England has but one answer: "If you do not like the conditions of the connection you are at liberty to separate."

The Government of Canada is nearly independent. A veto is retained by England, but it is scarcely ever used. All the taxes raised in Canada are applied exclusively to Canadian purposes. English goods and commodities coming into the country are taxed as highly as the goods of any other nation. Not one penny is contributed by Canada to the support of any Imperial establishment. Not only is this the case, but the foreign service of Canada is performed gratuitously by the English Government, and previous to the late treaty Canadian fisheries were protected by the English fleet. It would seem difficult to determine then upon what grounds Canada could demand the further aid of an army being kept in Canada at the expense of England. It is true

that the conquest of Canada by the United States would be a blow to the prestige, glory, and greatness of England, and to preserve these an army ought to be constantly on hand. The same object could be attained, no doubt, by the abandonment of Canada; but, in the opinion of many Englishmen, this would be as detrimental to English greatness as its conquest, but it is open to question whether the actual policy pursued is not more humiliating than either. The submitting to *ex post facto* laws, the apology offered for acts which were no offence by international law before these *ex post facto* laws were made, and the payment of $15,000,000 may appear more consonant to the dignity of the Empire than abandoning Canada, but the humiliation is much greater, especially when the so-called abandoning of Canada would only be starting into national life a great and kindred people. However, if that people will not accept the boon of self-government, England is not to blame, and in justice and honor her answer is sufficient. If the Canadian people are content to bear the evils flowing from the connection—which connection is a source of embarrassment to both countries, then they have no one to blame but themselves.

This connection is not only a source of embarrassment to England and Canada, but it is the cause of actual injury to the latter in more than one respect, which independence only can remedy. The progress made by all new countries depends chiefly on the number of people who immigrate to them, and the chief inducements which new countries offer to the inhabitants of old ones is the absence of all the evils and losses which they sustain in their own. Whether well or ill founded, it is the belief of the laboring masses of Europe that the monarchical institutions of their own countries are the great source of the evils under which they labor. On the whole the belief is well founded in almost all the monarchical countries of Europe except France, whose people are not given to leave their native land. Constitutionalism in Europe, out of England is rarely practised and imperfectly understood. The privileges inherent in the

aristocracy for ages, and the accumulation of the land and wealth in their hands, have shut the people out from political power, and limited them to the two privileges of producing taxes and performing military duty. To escape these duties and to obtain the position of a citizen in a free country, as well as to better his condition by making money, is the great object of the immigrant. Canada cannot offer citizenship to any one simply because she has not the power to confer British citizenship, and she has none of her own to offer. It may be in her power to enable the foreigner to vote and to exercise all the duties of a citizen within her borders, but the moment he departs from Canada he is relegated to the protection of his native land or none at all. It is humiliating to think that if a German resident should wish to travel after living twenty years in Canada, and having paid taxes and performed military duty all that time, he should have to look to Germany for protection, and even if required be made to perform the military duties which he owes to that country as his native land. In view of that fact it is not surprising that when agents were sent to Germany a short time ago to induce the people to emigrate, that the German Government issued a circular, warning all people of the consequence, and stating if they went to Canada they would have no country. This fact was brought to the notice of the authorities here by a German Canadian travelling in Germany, but of course they are powerless in such matters and can do nothing. In consequence of its present position, Canada is shut out from the labor market of Europe, except that portion of the Continent comprised by the British isles. It might be apprehended that in the case of the mother country, Canada would make up in what population she received what she lost in the other countries of Europe. But notwithstanding the facts, that it is under the same crown and possesses free institutions, notwithstanding the efforts put forth every year by the Canadian Government, it seems that the dependent position of the country is just as effective in repelling the inhabitants of

Britain as those of any other country. The repor tof the Imperial Commissioners for 1871 is abundant proof of this fact. During that year the total number of persons who left the United Kingdom was 252,435 : of which 102,452 were English ; 71,067 Irish ; 19,232 Scotch, and 53,246 foreigners. Of these 198,843 went to the United States, and only 32,671 to British North America—that is more than six times the number that came to Canada went to the United States. And from the statistics of past years the proportions were about the same. It may be objected that it is not the political position of the country that is the cause of this inequality ; but it can be nothing else. All the cities and towns in Ontario were and are hindered and delayed in building for want of labor—want of labor in supplying and manufacturing material and also in using it. Farmers, lumberers, and contractors throughout the country are impeded in their operations for want of labor. And in some instances have formed private associations for the purpose of procuring it from Europe. In consequence of this demand, wages are just as high, and in some cases higher in Canada than they are in the United States, taking into consideration the differences in the value of money and its purchasing power in the two countries. In the State of Maryland experienced farm laborers get with board $14.33 currency per month in the summer, and $11.00 per month in the winter. Ordinary hands, however, which are the general class of laborers, only get $11.71 and $9.21 during the same months. On an average the experienced man gets $12.66 a month with board during the year, and the ordinary laborer gets $10.46 a month, which at 90 cents to the dollar, which is a high estimate, is equal to $10.67 and $9.40 respectively of Canadian money. As these sums are the lowest given in Canada, if the difference in the price be taken into consideration, it will be seen how much lower farm laborers' wages are in the United States than in Canada.

Again as to mechanics. In Baltimore, journeymen carpenters get $15.72 per week for nine hours labor per day,

that time being a day's work; bricklayers $27.00, hodcarriers $15.00, stonemasons $18.00, plumbers $24.00, plasterers $19.50, painters $18.25, and painters and grainers $30.00. These figures will give an idea of how labor is remunerated in the State of Maryland, a middle State of the Union and therefore a fair standard for the whole country, and it will be perceived that, owing to the difference in money and the increased price of all necessaries of life, the laborer and the artizan are better off in Canada.

The dependent position of Canada not only prevents immigration but also prevents the investment of capital in the country. Connection with England must involve Canada in any war which may arise between that country and the United States. Indeed in such an event, it is too apparent that Canada would be the battle-ground between the two nations, and would be devastated as much as the Palatinate was by the French, or the Shenandowah Valley in the late American civil war. No English capitalist will invest his money in a country liable to such misfortunes, and accordingly while half the enterprise of the United States is supported by English capital, the rich coal-mines and mineral wealth of Canada are left as they were formed by nature.

It may be said that these results may have occurred from an ignorance abroad of the resources of the country, and that they may be obviated by the proper instrumentality. The appointment of agents to encourage immigration and to disseminate knowledge of the nature of the soil, climate, and general resources of the country might have the effect of directing the stream of immigration, which now flows so uninterruptedly into the United States, into Canada. These all have been tried, and tried in vain. It is hopeless to endeavor to instil into the German, the Swede, or Irishman the knowledge of the country possessed by Canadians themselves. Yet with all this knowledge Canadians by the thousand leave Canada every year; and all efforts to entice strangers among us by making the country known to them must be fruitless when such knowledge is not sufficient to keep the

native Canadians from going to the United States. Efforts of this kind are now being made by the different Provinces of the Dominion. Each of them has granted large sums of money to defray the expenses of immigration agents in foreign countries, and to assist intending emigrants; but the effect of such grants will only be to increase the flood that is pouring into the Western States. People may be induced to come to Canada by pecuniary aid, but they will not stay there any more than the natives. The experience of the last decade proves this. In 1860 the population of the four Provinces of Ontario, New Brunswick, Quebec and Nova Scotia was 3,090,561 and in 1871 it was 3,485,761, a little over 12 per cent., while the increase in the white population of the United States is 24 per cent. At the same rate of increase, at what time will the great North West be filled up? The construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, if the country be able to build it, may to a certain extent neutralize the want of independence, and at some remote period populate the fertile plains now belonging to the Dominion; but a number of years will be wasted in waiting. It is the fashion to boast of the progress that is being made under colonial government; but this is not the proper criterion. The real question is not what has been done, but what might be done, and what ought to be done. From 1850 to 1870, the States of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska, increased in population from 5,403,597 to 12,966,930. During that time the population of Canada, including all the present Provinces, increased 1,300,000 at the most. While Canada has been gaining 1,300,000, all the great States of the West have been settled and built up, and the country which only possessed three and a half millions of people at the close of the Revolutionary war, has now 38,000,000. The vast difference between the populations of the two countries must continue so long as Canada continues a dependency. In that position she suffers enormous disadvantages, and cannot even hope to increase in proportion to the present

populations. Some people foolishly think that the United States have exhausted nearly all their available territory, and that the large grants to railroad and other companies will soon leave little land for settlement, but statistics shew immense territories yet in the hands of the Government; and the policy of the country on the question of land grants to corporations is not so liberal as it was formerly.

Apart from all the material advantages which might legitimately be hoped from independence, there are the moral advantages which are greater than all. Under the present system there is no past to be proud of, no present to give reliance, and no future to hope for. Devoid of national life the country lies like a corpse, dead and stagnant; but not so bad as it has been. Confederation has infused some spirit into the people by the hopes it holds out, and enterprise, which seemed to have died out, has received a new impetus. Trade, which before this great measure was bound and trammeled by the tariffs and custom-houses of the different Provinces, now flows freely, and with redoubled activity between them. The immense enterprises which have been set on foot and projected as its immediate consequences have surprised the people out of their sleep, and shown them their former lethargy, and a spirit, active, energetic and enterprising, is abroad in the land. Since the year 1863 the moneys in circulation and bank deposits have more than trebled.

If such results flow from the very initiation of nationality, what results might not be expected from its complete fruition; vitalized by the spirit of nationality, Canada would leap forward on the road of progress—her people imbued with self-reliance, enterprise and independence, would accomplish more in twenty years than they would in a hundred in their present position.

As independence, then, would prevent absorption by the United States, preserve Canadian territory, induce immigration and the investment of foreign capital, and stimulate progress and enterprise, it would therefore be beneficial to the country, and is to be desired.

CHAPTER VI.

Could Canada Support Independence?

To every Canadian imbued with a love of his country, it must be a question of vital importance whether Canada would be able to sustain self-government in its entirety, in the event of its becoming separated from the parent state. It is evident that in taking this question into consideration, the power or wealth of the community, the number of its inhabitants, and their fitness or capacity for self-government, are the questions to be considered. In comparison with other countries which have sustained independence for centuries, it must be admitted that ours presents many strong and favorable contrasts. It may be urged that the circumstances under which many nations at present exercising self-governing powers, commenced or originated, are entirely different from those at present existing relative to Canada; but there is no doubt that the general rules which apply to all communities must apply equally well to Canada. On a general view, Canada stands in a much more favorable position for independence than any European State. In Europe, the State that would attempt to sustain itself must be prepared to contend with powers of which ancient history furnishes no parallel, while in America the only power in the world which could affect Canada would be the United States, whose motives for aggression would be reduced to a minimum by a separation from England, and with regard to that power, Canada is only accessible to it on one side, while the smaller powers of Europe are surrounded on all sides by enemies just as grasping, just as rapacious and far more powerful than the United States. The connections and combinations of European dynasties, no doubt, contribute

greatly to the independence of the lesser European kingdoms; but this cannot be urged in favor of Switzerland, a country which, by its own inherent power, has sustained itself for centuries. As inherent power must therefore be taken into consideration, it may be well to see how many of the lesser kingdoms of Europe are only equal if not below Canada in population, territory, trade and shipping. Switzerland, Portugal, Greece, Denmark and Holland, are all below our country in everything which constitutes nationality, while Belgium, Bavaria and Sweden proper, are not much larger. It is true that the independence of the most of these countries is sustained by the policy of the greater powers. The absorption of any of them by one of the great powers would make that power too strong for its neighbors, and hence the jealousy with which any encroachments on the weaker nations is watched and resented. The best modern instance of this, is the case of Belgium during the last war between France and Prussia. In that case we see England, at the risk of being drawn into a long war, extorting treaties from both the powers of France and Prussia to respect the independence of Belgium, although, however, withdrawn from intervention in continental affairs.

The independence of Canada must be sustained, if granted by similar means. The United States are advancing with strides utterly amazing to the countries of the Old World. The commercial supremacy of the Americans in the East is acknowledged by all. They are the real rulers of Japan, and so soon as the diminution of their debt will enable them to reduce their tariffs they must regain their legitimate influence in commerce in the West. American influence is as powerful to-day on the continent of Europe as that of England. If such be the case now, how would it be if Canada were annexed to it? It does not require any political sagacity or diplomatic skill to see the immense disadvantage to England of a material increase in the power of the United States. England has seen it years ago, and the confederation of Canada was the result.

If the Provinces which now constitute the Dominion had been left as they were, annexation of the whole must have occurred. It might not have taken place at once, but it was inevitable. Separated as they were by hostile tariffs and different interests they must have fallen into the rapacious maw that was always open to receive them. Rather than see this, England preferred their independence. Independent, they would be a strong, powerful ally, or at least a friend; annexed, they would be too great an addition to her already colossal rival. Hence confederation. It required the pressure of strong events to force England to not only consent to this measure, but actually to insist on its completion. How is it that the different provinces of Australia are not forced or invited into confederation, or why is not the system introduced any where else but in Canada? No where else is its necessity so manifest. The United States perfectly understood the object of the measure in Canada. They saw what an obstacle it must be to their influence and hopes. They might enforce the Munroe doctrine, but of what effect was it to expel the English from Canada, if English institutions and English principles remained as firm as ever in the country. Hence the counterstroke of purchasing Alaska. As territory, this cold, barren, unfruitful country is not worth $7,000,000; but, as a flank movement on Canada, and forming a northern base, it is worth to the United States hundreds of millions. At the time they obtained the land included in Minnesota, and Washington territory it did not seem any more valuable than Alaska does now, but this territory at present is the most fertile in the United States, and Alaska may yet, in some not very remote period, prove by its annoyance to our country that Seward, as usual, obtained an advantage for his country overlooked by English statesmen.

England having put her hand to the matter, having started the machinery of confederation in motion, cannot withdraw. Neither is her object attained by confederation. The mere

hanging together of the different Provinces will not save them. There must be complete union, and complete union means nationality. England has done every thing compatible with the position of Canada to endow it with nationality. No sooner was it confederated than she sent a Governor General who made known her wishes. Previous to him, the Governors were not much in the habit of accepting invitations to public dinners, and making speeches. But he seemingly introduced the custom with an object. He spoke frequently and forcibly of the new nationality which had been started in the world, of its hopes of success, and of the new connection which must exist between it and the mother country, calling it alliance instead of allegiance. The most obtuse could not fail to see the drift of these speeches; they evidently meant to reconstruct the public mind so as to be adapted to the new order of things. Public opinion in England seconded all the efforts of the Governor; the leading papers of the Metropolis spoke openly of the object of confederation and of its ultimate result, independence. But these papers did not speak so plainly then as they did after the Washington Treaty. After the completion of that bargain the *Times*, the leading paper in England, came out unmistakeably. The following extract will show the spirit of its teachings: "When the Canadians turn round on us and say you have muddled away our interests without obtaining for us aught that we desired, you have abandoned our fisheries, you have sacrificed our frontier, you have not given us open trade with the States, you have not secured any satisfaction of our claims for wanton injuries, what answer shall we give? We must begin by confessing our faults. It is true we have failed, we did our best, but we had to keep one eye on ourselves and another eye on you, and all the time to watch the temper and meaning of the American commissioners, with very little intelligence to guide our interpretation of their words; and if the result is not satisfactory to you neither is it to ourselves. This we must say if we would be frank; but we may go on to add

something more. It is this : from this time forth look after your own business yourselves; you are big enough, you are strong enough, you are intelligent enough, and if there were any deficiency in any of these points, it would be supplied by the education of self-reliance. We are both now in a false position, *and the time has arrived* when we should be relieved from it. *Take up your freedom*, your days of apprenticeship are over."

It is nonsense to say that this is not the language of England. The *Times* is the leading English paper, the paper of the governing class. If such sentiments were not concurred in by its supporters, it would not have dared to express them. But these sentiments are shared by all the leading English newspapers. There are a few of the extreme Tory papers which do not go so far, but all parties in England agree as to what must eventually happen with regard to Canadian connection. An attempt has been made to get up a feeling antagonistic to Canadian independence in England; but the movement was a failure, and the Federal Empire party there at present scarcely exists. When we come to think that confederation was initiated by an English Tory Government, and Nova Scotia forced into the Union by such a government, we must know what the feeling is in England.

Then, granted that confederation must eventually end in independence, and that this result is desired by England, the same motive which induced England to save the provinces from annexation by confederation, must also induce her to protect and guarantee Canadian independence. We have seen what that motive was, and it must exist in greater force every year, inasmuch as Canada and the United States are growing more powerful, and their union would, therefore, be more formidable.

This guarantee system is not at all new in the colonial relations of Great Britain. It was the tie which existed for some time between England and the Ionian Islands. An English commissioner administered the government in these

lands until they were ceded to Greece. The connection, however, which exists between Belgium and England is a better illustration of what might be desired for Canada. In this instance, we see one country perfectly independent, but whose independence would not have lasted ten years were it not for England. Belgium lies alongside of France; the language of her people is chiefly French; and the habits and customs of the country are very similar to those of France. These circumstances are exactly similar to those of Canada with respect to the United States, and to make the similarity more complete, the inequality in the populations of Belgium and France is about the same which exists between the populations of Canada and the United States; but, nevertheless, England has prevented the absorption of Belgium by France. She is in no better position to be guardian to Belgium than she is to fill that position with regard to Canada. She is isolated by the sea from Belgium as she is from Canada. In either case guardianship would have to be exercised by her Navy with the assistance she would have from the people of either country in case of attack.

Now, what is the result of this kind of connection. Belgium is the most prosperous country in Europe, and the most thickly populated. She has 451 people to the square mile, England itself has only 389, and the proportion of paupers in England's population is double that in the population of Belgium. Belgium has one mile of railway to every six miles of territory; England has one mile to every eight miles of territory. England and Belgium are equal as regards telegraphs; they have each one mile to every four miles of territory. This is what is to be expected. The expansive powers of the people of Belgium have full vent. Having full confidence in the power of their great protector, independence gives them self-reliance, and they launch out into all manner of enterprise. Their machinery to-day is vieing with that of England even in her own cities, and the products of Belgian industry compete in all the markets of Europe with the native productions.

Now, who are the Belgians, that they should deserve any favors from England? Are they of the same race, of the same habits? do they speak the same language? or perhaps, like Hanover, Belgium was connected with the crown of England. Nothing of the kind. They are simply a mongrel population of French and Dutch, split off from the Netherlands only a short time ago, and erected into a kingdom from motives of policy. They are aliens to England in everything. If such a people obtain the protection of England, Canada must be entitled to it, especially when the political inducements to its support are as great as regards England, as they are in the case of Belgium. The rivalry between France and England is not so great as that between America and the latter power; and the French people never hated England any worse than the Americans. If then, there are the same political reasons, if not greater ones, than exist in the case of Belgium why England should guarantee the independence of Canada, and if the majority of Canadians are bone of her bone and flesh of her flesh, who have stood by her in many a hard-fought battle, and if above all it was England which initiated and encouraged Canadian nationality, then England would guarantee Canadian independence, otherwise she would be false to that career which for the last two hundred years has made her respected by the world as the first nation, not only in power, but in honor, and the respect with which she regards and fulfils all her obligations.

This guarantee would not cost England much. It is more than probable that Canada would not require her active assistance until such time as she would be nearly able to defend herself alone. If the progress made by the United States be taken as the criterion, twenty years would enable Canada, under independence, to hold her own against all enemies. At present Canada could raise an army equal to those of the Great Powers of Europe, on a war-footing. The only question would be her ability to maintain them in the field for any length of time. Canada has at present nearly

seven hundred and ninety-one thousand male inhabitants, between the ages of fifteen and forty-five, that is over three-quarters of a million of men. Switzerland, in the midst of enemies, maintains her independence with an army of two hundred thousand men. That country, no doubt, is more inaccessible than Canada some portions of the year, but not more so during winter. It may be said that Canada is safe during the winter months. The experience of the Americans on this point is conclusive. Every expedition of theirs undertaken in the winter season has been a failure. Indeed, it is doubtful if military operations of any consequence could be undertaken at all during the winter months. Sleeping in a canvas tent or a bivouac one night with the thermometer ten or twenty degrees below zero, would paralyze the best army ever got together. The great drawback to Canada in a military point of view is she has no backbone. One hundred miles in on the American frontier and the cuticle is not passed. One hundred miles into Canada and you are clean through on the other side, and in some places half that distance is sufficient. Time and independence are the only remedies for this, and it is during this time that we need the guarantee.

Another element of strength belonging to Canada is her naval power, and her facility for building vessels. The maritime population of Canada used to seafaring is very large. Including the fishermen of Newfoundland, who would be available in case of war, she would have at least fifty thousand hardy trained men to man her vessels or those which she might get from England. This population must in itself be formidable, and of the greatest value to the Dominion.

Owing to the great improvements in war vessels and naval gunnery, it is not probable that our present shipping would be of much use in case of war; but it is certain that we could manufacture as good a fleet out of it as would be opposed to us.

In all crude materials, for warlike purposes, Canada has within herself large supplies. Sulphur, charcoal, iron,

saltpetre and all the ingredients for the manufacture of gunpowder are formed in amazing quantities in different parts of her territory.

The chief want which would be felt in case of war would be money. The means to sustain an army, from the industry of which army in time of peace the chief revenue of the country is raised, would have to be found elsewhere or borrowed. No doubt England would furnish from her almost inexhaustible coffers these means on our credit, or she would subsidize us as she did nearly all Europe except France during the Napoleonic wars.

Among all the elements of defense which would be available to Canada none would be so potent as the spirit of her people. In times not distant that spirit proved its strength. Whether French or English Canadian was engaged with the enemy each proved beyond a doubt that the warlike character of the nations from which they sprang had not degenerated in their persons. The French under DeSalaberry fought as bravely and devotedly as the English under Brock. At this time they fought as British colonists between the position of whom at that time and the free citizen of independent Canada there would be as much difference as that between the American citizen and the English peasant. At that time when her inhabitants fought so well and did such service for England, Canada had not even the system of responsible government. The inducements offered to Canadians for their lives were not many; but nevertheless they acted bravely. With independence they would have a country to love, a future to hope for, and a flag to inspire them. These are great aids. Before now, they have changed the fate of battles against immense odds. Three hundred Greeks who blocked the way of the Persian host at Thermopylæ show what patriotism can do. Its effects are seen through all European history; the bare-legged Swiss pikemen who defeated the cavalry of Austria at Morgarthen, the Scotchmen who defeated the English army at Bannockburn, the ragged *Sans Culottes* who beat the Austrians at Jemappe were all living walls of patriotism whom no power could conquer.

It has become the fashion to decry this feeling in Canada. Colonial patriotism was a thing until lately discouraged in England, and, because so discouraged, was sneered at by many in Canada. Patriotism in Canada was all right, but it must not take in the country itself. The Fenian raids dissipated this idea. It was then found that, without local patriotism, all the forts and defences Canada could build would be useless.

Let us then in the present, as a safeguard for the future, foster by every means this feeling of patriotism which has been in all nations and ages the greatest defense of freedom. The anniversary, the patriotic song, the national air, and the national symbols and emblems, should be encouraged in every way. The Americans know the value of these things which to Canadians seem silly. Millions are spent every year in the United States in diffusing patriotic feeling, and the whole nation is in a short time to celebrate the centenary of its existence with that object. The Canadian Government should do the same thing. The national anniversary should be declared a legal holiday, and public funds provided for its celebration all over the country. A public reward ought to be offered for the best national air. This seems to have an effect among an intelligent people greater than all others. The national symbols appeal to the eye, but it is the national air that strikes the ear and the heart. The success of this means is best illustrated by the French air, the Marseillaise. This air has been described as the French Revolution set to music, and well it might be; it swept Europe like a whirlwind, and thousands have walked fearlessly, gladly to the death inspired by its patriotic strains.

The Dominion of Canada is large enough to have some separate and distinct symbol even at present. The mercantile fleet of the country ought to be designated in foreign parts, and if a Canadian Lloyds be established it will become a necessity. There is no approach to being a distinct people without a flag. In all civilized times it has, as it were,

personified the people, and now no nation can be insulted so surely as by an indignity to its flag.

All these things may to our hard-working, matter-of-fact people seem silly, but they are the things which build up the sentiment which sustains nations. Napoleon declared that it was by the imagination he conquered Europe, and nations can be saved as well as conquered by the same means.

On the whole the prospect is that Canada could sustain independence. She is doing so in reality at present. In all things affecting the country itself, Canada governs itself. The only thing to complete her sovereignty is power to transact her business and intercourse with foreign powers. All the expense necessary to self-government is sustained by Canada with the exception of the expense of a diplomatic body, and that would not cost much. Representation at the capitals of the Great Powers would only be necessary. An ambassador at Washington, London, Paris, Berlin, Vienna and St. Petersburg could be supported for $50,000 a year, and we pay that sum now to a Governor-General. The labor and trouble which would be saved to Canadian merchants by having a man in Washington alone, through whom Canadian business could be done directly with the American Government, would pay for the extra expense. If then so little extra expense is required and such great benefits are to be obtained, is not independence to be desired. That independence if obtained would be prized above all earthly considerations by Canadians, and it would only be lost when there would not be left five thousand men in the country to fight for it. The new state might not be at first very formidable—so much the better for its success; it would not attract the envy or rivalry of any other nation. There are many among us who think and say that we are not strong enough to support nationality, but,

> "What constitutes a state ?
> Not high raised battlement or labored mound,
> Thick wall or moated gate;
> Not cities proud with spires and turrets crowned;

Not bays or broad-armed ports,
Where, laughing at the storm, rich navies ride;
Not starred and spangled courts,
Where low-bred baseness wafts perfume to pride:
No, men, high-minded men,
With powers as far above dull brutes endued,
In forest, brake or den,
As beasts excel cold rocks and brambles rude;
Men who their duties know,
But know their rights, and, knowing, dare maintain,
Prevent the well-aimed blow;
And crush the tyrant as they rend the chain,—
These constitute a state,
And sovereign law that states collected will.
O'er thrones and globes elate
Sits Empress crowning good, repressing ill."

It is independence and independence alone that will ever enable Canada to fulfil her destiny, to be the asylum for the oppressed and downtrodden-peoples of Europe—an asylum where, under their own vine and fig tree, they can live in the enjoyment of happiness and liberty, perpetuating British institutions down to the most remote generations.